



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022

No. 48

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 17, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### MINORITY HEALTH DISPARITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Madam Speaker, today I rise with a great sense of gratitude. Gratitude for the opportunity to serve the people's House and gratitude for passing my first standalone bill, H.R. 189, the John Lewis National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities Research Endowment Revitalization Act. It passed the House and Senate, and on a bipartisan basis to

boot. The bill is on its way to the President's desk, and on Friday, President Joe Biden will sign it in a White House ceremony that this kid from the harbor area of Los Angeles never dreamed was possible.

This is a full circle moment for me, one that made me tear up last night as I sat to reflect how I got here and how my passion on the issue of disparities in health took shape.

In 1998 as a young college student, I had an opportunity to work as an intern in the Clinton White House. I worked in the Office of Public Liaison doing African-American outreach under Ben Johnson and Minyon Moore. It was during my work there that I learned about the issue of racial health disparities. At the time, United States Surgeon General David Satcher highlighted the issue, and it became a passion of mine.

A year later I would continue my work on the issue and in the healthcare space at the NAACP with Hilary Shelton. Ben Johnson and Hilary Shelton mentored and inspired me. They encouraged me to keep up my work on the issue.

Today, as a Member of Congress, the issue of racial health disparities and the need for us to close the healthcare gap is among my top priorities. In that light, during the 116th Congress when I was in my second term, an opportunity arose to work with organizations like the Association of Minority Health Professions Schools and others on a bill to help fund research on health disparities at schools of excellence.

I remember approaching our friend, the late John Lewis, about the bill. He encouraged me to fight and to get it across the finish line, and he agreed to become an original cosponsor.

In this Congress, the 117th Congress, I renamed the bill in honor of my friend, the late John Lewis. H.R. 189 is now the John Lewis National Institute on Minority Health and Health Dispari-

ties Research Endowment Revitalization Act.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia, Representative BUDDY CARTER, for being a co-lead on the bill. The Senate bill, S. 320, was introduced and championed by Senators BILL CASSIDY and BRIAN SCHATZ. I am grateful for their work to get this across the finish line and Senator CASSIDY for being gracious.

H.R. 189 will, once again, allow for current and former NIMHD or Health Resources & Services Administration Centers of Excellence to receive research endowment funding, money that is critical in the fight to reduce minority health disparities.

The research endowment program at the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities provides funding to the endowments of academic institutions across the country. Schools like Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science will qualify; Morehouse School of Medicine, the University of Puerto Rico School of Dental Medicine, Tuskegee University College of Veterinary Medicine, Xavier University of Louisiana College of Pharmacy, and many more will be eligible to receive funding under this bill.

The goals of the program include promoting minority health and health disparities research capacity and infrastructure, increasing the diversity and strength of the scientific workforce, and enhancing the recruitment and retention of individuals from health disparity populations that are underrepresented in the scientific workforce.

On Friday, 24 years after getting my start in politics at the White House, I will be back there again, this time as a Member of Congress to see H.R. 189 become law and move us one step closer to ending the disparities in public health facing communities of color.

For that I am grateful.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3779

### A PROMISE TO FIRST DO NO HARM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, when I first became a doctor, I made a promise that I would never perform, assist, or support in any abortion or any abortion procedures. All doctors take an oath. They swear to first do no harm. I made a promise that I would never participate in the taking of a human life.

At 10 weeks a baby in their mother's womb has developed a beating heart. At 11 weeks, the baby will have developed elbows, fingers, and toes. And at 27 weeks, a baby inside the womb can hear their mother's voice. It is clear that these children are human—constructed in the image of God—and worthy of protection and worthy of love.

It is time to protect human life, it is time to protect the unborn, and it is time to end this egregious practice of abortion.

#### RECOGNIZING THE WORK OF DR. GEORGE HRUZA

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Dr. George Hruza.

A graduate of New York University, Dr. Hruza went on to complete both a dermatology residency at New York University Medical Center as well as a laser surgery fellowship at Harvard Medical School. Later, Dr. Hruza completed a Mohs and dermatologic surgery fellowship at the University of Wisconsin-Madison with Dr. Fred Mohs.

Dr. Fred Mohs developed this revolutionary surgery—a technique that allows for the precise removal and the repair of skin cancer.

Throughout his career, Dr. Hruza has proven himself to be a leader in the field of dermatology. His tireless commitment to his patients and their families has undoubtedly saved countless lives.

Dr. Hruza has come to Washington and done skin cancer screenings for members of staff and Members of Congress—several who might be present here today.

As the American Academy of Dermatology's president, Dr. Hruza's relentless advocacy for innovation has helped to shape the way that skin cancer today is treated in the United States. Skin cancers were previously deadly. My own grandfather died from skin cancer, a skin cancer that would be treated today by someone like Dr. Hruza and cured.

It is my privilege to call Dr. George Hruza a leader, a colleague, and a friend of the United States Congress. As he continues his work as the United Skin Specialists Missouri director, I wish Dr. Hruza every continued success; his success in working to treat patients, his success in developing innovation, and his success as one of the leaders in dermatology not just in the

United States but throughout the world.

### CAREER AND TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Madam Speaker, as the coauthor of the bipartisan Strengthening Career and Technical Education in the 21st Century Act—the largest reform of skills-based education in more than a dozen years—I rise today to celebrate one institution that has become a national exemplar.

I am honored to join Congressman AUGUST PFLUGER from Texas in recognizing Dr. Gregory Williams at Odessa College. Odessa College has been named a top-10 community college by the Aspen Institute. Dr. Williams has seen both enrollment as well as students with passing grades increase year after year.

When we reformed CTE in 2018 and increased Federal funding by over 10 percent, we did so with educators like Dr. Williams in mind.

I commend Dr. Williams and Odessa College for their tremendous success. I will continue fighting for robust funding for skills-based and vocational education funding so that programs like Odessa's can flourish in my State of Illinois as well as across the country.

### NATIONAL AMERICORPS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, this week many people will be celebrating National AmeriCorps Week. I will not be one of them. AmeriCorps has been around for almost 30 years, and in that time we have learned never to underestimate the ability of the Federal Government to muck things up.

No one denies that AmeriCorps began with good intentions, and I applaud the philanthropic spirit of those who volunteer out of a genuine desire to help those in need. However, I cannot applaud a bloated bureaucratic organization that is the poster child for fraud and mismanagement.

AmeriCorps is entrusted with 1.1 billion taxpayer dollars every single year. And every single year AmeriCorps proves it is an expert at wasting taxpayer funds.

For example, some AmeriCorps programs cost taxpayers four to eight times more money than programs that perform identical services. Even more concerning is the fact that neither Congress, the Inspector General, nor AmeriCorps itself have an idea of how taxpayer dollars are being managed. In fact, AmeriCorps' financial statements are so bad that they have not been able to be audited for the past 5 years.

According to AmeriCorps' Inspector General, if this occurred at a private organization there would be a "whole-sale resignation or firing of the leadership team, and the public would be shorting their stock."

Even more concerning is the lack of oversight AmeriCorps provides over its grantees that are plagued with fraudulent activity. For example, a Hawaiian nonprofit executive was recently sentenced to 46 months in prison for embezzling over \$500,000 from AmeriCorps, and a school district in St. Louis was found guilty of encouraging AmeriCorps volunteers to falsely inflate time sheets.

The private sector often does the same work as AmeriCorps but at a fraction of the price and with far less waste, fraud, and mismanagement.

It is our job as Members of the House of Representatives to ensure that taxpayer funds are protected. The power of the purse is one of our most important constitutional duties. We therefore must stop feeding the black hole that is AmeriCorps and instead empower States and local governments to meet the needs of their residents.

The last time AmeriCorps' programs were reauthorized was in 2009 with the passage of the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act which was named in honor of the late Senator who was the author of the legislation that governs many of AmeriCorps' programs.

Yet, despite the support for national service, Senator Kennedy himself emphasized the importance of proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars, noting during a 1993 floor speech on the establishment of the corporation that "Congress will not, and should not, fund a program if it is unsuccessful."

I agree with him. AmeriCorps has had 29 years to prove itself, and the only thing it has proven is that it is a drain on taxpayers and a massive disappointment. This is a failed agency that needs to be overhauled completely or just eliminated.

□ 1015

### CONGRATULATING PRESIDENT BIDEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA) for 5 minutes.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate President Biden for the progress our Nation has made this past year. In early 2021, the President took office during a global crisis and was determined to get America back on track. He knew we needed a comeback. He knew we needed to focus on building a better America.

So what did President Biden do? He invested in the American people, and he invested big. The boom was beginning.

In March 2021, the American Rescue Plan was signed into law. In total, a historic \$1.9 trillion were put to work for the American people during the severe public health and economic crisis caused by COVID.

Since then, the American Rescue Plan has been helping us recover. We are now enjoying one of the strongest periods of economic growth in history, and we are building a better America.

If we look at the progress we have made over the past year, Madam Speaker, we can see how successful the American Rescue Plan truly has been.

The plan powered historic jobs recovery and produced the largest calendar increase in jobs on record. The unemployment rate dropped at a record pace, but we have also seen the biggest drop in long-term unemployment ever recorded in a 12-month span. Nearly 2.5 million people broke out of the cycle of long-term unemployment. Madam Speaker, this is huge.

As the Representative of a majority Latino district, I was especially proud to learn there were record drops in Latino and African-American unemployment rates. African-American unemployment fell by more than 30 percent. Latino unemployment fell from nearly 9 percent to 4.4 percent, the fastest drop ever recorded.

These are hardworking Americans going back to work, putting food on the table, and earning good paychecks. This is building a better America.

We have seen that when Americans have job opportunities, great things happen, and they do. That is why we also saw the lowest number of home foreclosures ever recorded. We also witnessed a record low number of credit card delinquencies.

The American Rescue Plan isn't only helping working adults. The American Rescue Plan's historic child tax credit benefits nearly 40 million families with 65 million children.

Madam Speaker, in my own home State, the child tax credit directly benefits nearly 7 million children, many in our area of Houston. Madam Speaker, that is a whole lot of children. Most families in Texas will receive several thousand extra dollars because of the increased 2021 child tax credit.

Because of these historic tax credits, child poverty rates have been slashed dramatically. In only 1 year, unemployment is at a record low, job opportunities are on the rise, and child poverty rates have been reduced. We are building a better America for all.

I am so proud we have a strong leader in the White House who is leading America to full recovery. President Biden got it right, Madam Speaker. He understood that betting on the American people is always a good idea. With the right resources, America will win. We will all win. It is just that simple. Together, we really are building a better America.

#### RECOGNIZING THE LEGACY OF DAVID RUDD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUSTOFF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the legacy of

David Rudd, who is retiring as the president of the University of Memphis.

Dr. David Rudd came to the University of Memphis in 2013 as the provost for the university. He had previously served as the dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Science and scientific director of the National Center for Veterans Studies at the University of Utah.

President Rudd succeeded Dr. Shirley Raines as president and Brad Martin as interim president of the University of Memphis, becoming the University of Memphis president in 2014.

The University of Memphis has a student population of around 22,000 students, with 17 bachelor's degrees in more than 250 areas of studies, master's degrees in 54 subjects, doctoral degrees in 26 disciplines, and graduate certificate programs in 44 areas of study. The University of Memphis also has one of the finest law schools in the southeast United States.

No matter your alma mater, one thing most can agree on is that it is extremely challenging leading a school of higher education today, especially in the era of COVID.

With that said, the University of Memphis has flourished under David Rudd's tenure as president. There have been a number of major accomplishments during this time. Maybe the most significant achievement during the David Rudd era is the University of Memphis obtaining the research classification known as R1 by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. For the first time in its history, this puts the University of Memphis in the top tier of research universities across the Nation.

I asked my friend, Doug Edwards, the chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Memphis, about David Rudd. Doug told me: "David Rudd is a transformative leader who has had a profound impact on the University of Memphis. He has elevated the stature of the university to that of the second flagship university in Tennessee and a top-tier research institution."

Soon Dr. Rudd will take a well-deserved sabbatical from his leadership and administrative duties. When he comes back to the University of Memphis in the next year, he will return to teaching and research as a distinguished professor of psychology and will run the new Rudd Institute for Veteran and Military Suicide Prevention at the University of Memphis.

The institute is appropriately named. As a veteran of the Gulf war and a former Army psychologist, David Rudd is one of the Nation's leading experts on suicide prevention among our Nation's veterans.

We wish the utmost best to him and his wife, Dr. Loretta Rudd, herself a distinguished educator and researcher in higher education.

On behalf of the many alumni and residents of the Eighth Congressional

District of Tennessee, Roberta and I congratulate, salute, and honor David Rudd for his remarkable and outstanding tenure as the president of the University of Memphis.

#### HONORING REVEREND FRED SHUTTLESWORTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a true civil rights pioneer, Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, ahead of what would have been his 100th birthday on Friday, March 18.

Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth was a civil rights activist who led the fight against segregation and other forms of racism as a minister in Birmingham, Alabama. He was a cofounder of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, initiated and was instrumental in the 1963 Birmingham campaign, also known as Project C, for confrontation, to desegregate the city of Birmingham.

Regarded as one of the most courageous civil rights fighters in the South by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Reverend Shuttlesworth was a fearless freedom fighter who always stood up for what is right.

Shuttlesworth participated in the sit-ins against segregated lunch counters in 1960 and took part in the organization and completion of the Freedom Riders in 1961.

Throughout his amazing career, despite experiencing violent intimidation and numerous attempts on his life, Reverend Shuttlesworth remained vigilant in his fight for civil rights. The noted pastor of the Bethel Baptist Church is recognized as the key leader and organizer of the civil rights movement in Birmingham, Alabama.

In recognition of his lifelong dedication, President Clinton awarded Reverend Shuttlesworth the Presidential Citizens Medal in 2001. Shortly after, in 2008, the Birmingham-Shuttlesworth International Airport was named in his honor.

Although Reverend Shuttlesworth died at the age of 89 on October 5 of 2011, he has a long list of accomplishments. To that, the city of Birmingham is designating this Friday, March 18, as the Reverend Shuttlesworth Day in honor of the 100th anniversary of his birthday.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me and the city of Birmingham to pay tribute to the extraordinary life and legacy of Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth as we designate March 18 as Reverend Shuttlesworth Day.

#### HONORING MRS. BEATRICE PRICE

Ms. SEWELL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the remarkable life and legacy of Beatrice Price, a pioneering Army nurse to the Tuskegee Airmen during World War II, who passed away at the age of 98 on March 4, 2022.

Joining the military shortly after completing nursing school, Mrs. Price

honorably served alongside the legendary Tuskegee Airmen until her discharge in 1948.

A trailblazer and pioneer in the field of nursing, Mrs. Price had a stellar 42-year career in nursing, spending more than 34 years working at the Birmingham VA Medical Center where she once again cared for our servicemen and servicewomen with great distinction until her retirement in January of 1988.

On a personal note, Mrs. Price was a source of great inspiration for me and so many young women. She was devoted to her church, her family, and her service to this Nation. A woman of tremendous faith, Mrs. Price served honorably during World War II alongside the legendary Tuskegee Airmen.

As Alabama's first Black Congresswoman, it was my high honor to bestow upon her a Congressional Gold Medal for her courage, bravery, and exemplary service. I was also thrilled to host Mrs. Price in Washington at the State of the Union in 2013.

For her many accomplishments, Mrs. Price was always gracious, always compassionate, and always humble. I am eternally grateful for our friendship, her mentorship, and our special bond. I thank her family for sharing her with the world.

May we find comfort in knowing that she lived a full and blessed life. Her legacy will live on in the hearts and actions of those she impacted. Rest in peace and power, thy good and faithful servant.

On behalf of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the extraordinary life and legacy of Mrs. Beatrice Price and her tremendous service to this Nation.

#### RECOGNIZING NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize National Agriculture Week, which begins on March 20, a week dedicated to honoring and acknowledging the efforts and hard work of American farmers and farm families.

While farmers, ranchers, producers, foresters, and farmworkers should be celebrated year-round, National Agriculture Week shines a bright light on where our Nation's food, fiber, and fuel come from. I have always said every American interacts with agriculture at least three times a day, whether they realize it or not: breakfast, lunch, and dinner. It is a fundamental part of our lives, and it is the backbone of the American economy.

Celebrated during National Agriculture Week, National Agriculture Day began in 1973 as a way to recognize the unique value that farmers, ranchers, and foresters contribute to our so-

ciety, contributions that have only grown in importance over the past 2 years as the world faced a pandemic, global supply chain disruptions, economic instability, and, now, war in Europe.

Being a farmer has never been an easy job by any means. Feeding and clothing our Nation and the entire world is a monumental task. Every day, America's farm families dedicate their minds and bodies to achieving that feat.

Unfortunately, many farmers today are facing rising input costs, shrinking profit margins, and unrelenting supply chain issues, much of which has been self-inflicted by leadership in Washington, yet they continue to persevere.

As Republican leader of the House Agriculture Committee, I am honored to represent farm families in rural America and serve as their reliable voice in the Halls of Congress.

National Agriculture Week encourages every American to: understand how food and fiber products are produced; appreciate the role agriculture plays in providing a safe, abundant, and affordable food supply; value the essential role of agriculture in our economy; and acknowledge and consider successful career opportunities in the agriculture industry.

As the Representative of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, I have the great privilege of working firsthand with many farmers and foresters. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we are fortunate to have more than 59,000 farms. These men and women work hard to feed and clothe not just Pennsylvanians but our Nation and overseas. Their hard work results in agriculture being Pennsylvania's number one industry.

Agriculture and its associated industries contribute more than \$135 billion, or about 18 percent of Pennsylvania's economy. The industry employs half a million workers, including 280,500 direct jobs.

I will end with one of my favorite quotes about agriculture from President Jefferson: "Agriculture . . . is our wisest pursuit, because it will in the end contribute most to real wealth, good morals, and happiness."

This sentiment rings just as true today as it did in President Jefferson's letter to George Washington in 1787. Our farm families truly embody the best of the American spirit through their moral integrity, hard work, and an unwavering dedication to their craft. Everyone in this Chamber and around the world benefits from the "wise pursuit" of agriculture, and we owe these patriots a resounding debt of gratitude.

I want to applaud the farmers, ranchers, and foresters who continue to devote their lives to American agriculture.

□ 1030

#### RUSSIA IS COMMITTING WAR CRIMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Madam Speaker, yesterday, the House of Representatives heard from Ukrainian President Zelenskyy as he painted a haunting picture of pain inflicted on the Ukrainian people and the war crimes being waged on Ukrainians trying to keep themselves and their families safe.

It is clear, Madam Speaker, that Vladimir Putin has committed war crimes by violating international norms, including the Geneva Convention, in his violent and bloody war of conquest on Ukraine.

I, along with Congressman DAVID CICILLINE, have introduced a war crimes resolution, H. Res. 964, calling on the global community to hold Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government accountable for these war crimes.

Russian forces have used explosive weapons with wide-range effects near schools and populated areas, hitting them with missiles, rockets, and heavy artillery. It is clearly a violation of the Geneva Convention to target civilian and cultural sites.

On March 1, a Russian airstrike hit Freedom Square in Kharkiv, killing civilians and injuring dozens of innocent people.

On March 1, a Russian missile hit the location of the Babyn Yar Holocaust Memorial site, a place where thousands of Jewish people were killed between 1941 and 1943.

On March 3, 47 civilians were killed when Russia hit two schools and apartment buildings, injuring countless others. This is clearly a violation of the Geneva Convention.

We have also witnessed the attack of medical units. On March 9, Russian forces bombed a maternity and children's hospital in the city of Mariupol. The world watched as a pregnant woman was being carried lifeless from the hospital wreckage on a stretcher. Both she and her child passed away.

The World Health Organization has also confirmed several attacks on healthcare centers in Ukraine, causing countless deaths and injuries.

It is clearly a violation of the Geneva Convention to target nuclear facilities. On March 3, Ukrainian President Zelenskyy accused Russian forces of nuclear terror as Russian tanks shot at the nuclear blocks at a nuclear power station in Ukraine.

More than 3 million people are now refugees who have fled Ukraine, Madam Speaker. Each day in Ukraine, more than 70,000 children have become refugees. That accounts for 55 children fleeing the country every minute.

There have been over 2,000 civilian casualties in the country, and thousands upon thousands of people have

been injured. Yesterday, the International Court of Justice overwhelmingly found that Russia must immediately suspend its unlawful military invasion of Ukraine.

It is clear, Madam Speaker, that Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government have committed war crimes. They have invaded a sovereign nation and are attacking the very core of liberty and democracy. We must hold them accountable and do all we can to support the brave Ukrainians fighting for their freedom.

#### AVOID WAR THROUGH FINANCIAL EXCELLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BUSTOS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. CAWTHORN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAWTHORN. Madam Speaker, when American projects weakness on the international stage, everyday Americans suffer. We know this. We are told this daily. But many everyday Americans feel that geopolitics is far removed from their lives.

So, let's answer the question: What does it cost for America to be weak on the world stage?

This cost is manifested at the pumps every day with 42 percent higher prices. It is shown as food prices soar. Meat, poultry, and eggs are all up over 10 percent.

Our weakness abroad produces hardships at home. If we lose our role as the world reserve currency, your buying power, your savings, and your property value could all sink to historic lows.

The preeminence of American currency has dominated the global landscape for decades, providing stability as the international bedrock of financial transactions and arrangements.

We are the world's reserve currency. We are the standard. But that great financial heritage is slipping away. Our children may soon call the world reserve currency by another name. Perhaps they will know it as the yuan.

The geopolitical ramifications of devalued and discarded American currency would not only signal a shift in financial confidence in the United States; it would dissolve our standing among global superpowers.

We are witnessing the death rattle of Pax Americana, meaning the era of American peace we have enjoyed in the world for decades.

America could lose a war with China without a single shot ever being fired if our dollar continues to be perpetually devalued.

Permanent Washington decision-makers, most of whom are over 30 to 50 years my senior, have clearly either not taken the time to sit and consider the cost of or, worse, simply ignored how hyperinflation is rotting the superiority of our Nation's currency and dragging with it young families, blue-collar workers, and the great American middle class.

American strength and leadership have been the driving force of peace for

the last half century. Nations unified behind the stability of the U.S. dollar, in large part because we backed our greenbacks with gold—substance, not fluff. We were the manufacturers of the world. The shift from a gold standard to a fiat currency began to starve America's financial preeminence. You cannot inflate gold, but you can print money out of thin air. When a currency is built on nothing but paper, it literally grows on trees. With this dramatic shift, America's leverage on the world stage began to slip away.

There can be no globalism when America refuses to relinquish its position as the preeminent currency. Countries also think twice before incurring the wrath of the United States when their own financial stability is tied to the endurance of our monetary system.

But, instead, our inflated, hollow monetary systems have given way to fantastical foreign policy. We have surrendered our financial security as the superpowers of the world wait eagerly in the wings. Our collapse signals their emergence.

Saudi Arabia, which has exclusively sold its oil using U.S. dollars, is now considering selling oil for the Chinese yuan. The Chinese Communist Party has been posturing for years to topple the dollar with their tender.

When the U.S. dollar falls, America will no longer remain dominant on the world stage, and peace will end. It is already happening. Vladimir Putin has illegally and immorally invaded Ukraine. The world is coming unraveled as our tender's resiliency plummets.

But I am sure you are asking yourself at home: Does this have to happen? In short, the answer is no. We can reclaim the mantle of financial excellence we once held. We can become the leader of the world again without having to expend the lives of young Americans.

Stooping to military interventionism is the goal of the war hawks here in Congress who are bought and paid for by those who stand to profit from forever wars.

If we are wise and shrewd, we can avoid ever needing to put boots on the ground to ensure peace. We can do this by dominating the world's economy.

To bring peace without bloodshed is actually quite simple. The key is to immediately reduce gas prices and energy prices by drilling the hell out of the Permian Basin and by granting every lease and incentivizing all necessary infrastructure atop the Bakken shale.

Furthermore, we should aggressively onshore manufacturing back to America, dominate the world market on precious minerals, and stop shipping our jobs overseas.

A strong American economy creates a strong U.S. currency. When America sits atop the world, peace will continue. Tyrants of the world, like Putin and Xi Jinping, will fear us when the only way to buy and sell energy is by using the U.S. dollar.

It is our solemn responsibility to pass a peaceful and prosperous nation on to the next generation. We are the leaders of the world. It is time we start acting like it.

Drill, baby, drill. America first now, and America first forever.

#### BROAD-BASED SANCTIONS ARE ECONOMIC WARFARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. OMAR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in solidarity with the Ukrainian people who are facing a cruel and inhumane war of aggression from a tyrant, Vladimir Putin.

I also stand in solidarity with my Ukrainian-American constituents whose friends and families are in harm's way.

We must address this war with courage, foresight, and humility. I am appalled by the extraordinary cruelty of Putin's war. I am also moved by the courage of the Ukrainians and also by the courage of the antiwar protesters in Russia, risking 15 years in prison for speaking out against Putin's aggression.

We must stand unified with the Ukrainian people. But even as we stand with the Ukrainian people, we must avoid the knee-jerk calls to make this conflict even worse.

One thing we should have learned throughout our history is that policy decisions we make simply based on fear or rage rarely end well. Increasingly, we are hearing voices calling for the United States and NATO to enter into war with Russia. For the most part, they are not saying this directly. They are using euphemisms like no-fly zone.

A no-fly zone is not simply declared. It must be militarily enforced. As the President said, a no-fly zone would mean the United States entering the war. It would mean the beginning of World War III.

We must reject this completely. The stakes are incredibly high. There has never been, on this Earth, a war between two or more nuclear powers.

There is a reason for this. Even in the madness of the Cold War, leaders around the world understood that nuclear war would mean the annihilation of humanity.

There are voices now that are shockingly casual about the risk of nuclear war. I am asking the American people to not believe them. Do not believe them when they tell you that it is going to be limited. Do not believe them when they tell you nuclear winter isn't real, or it isn't that bad. They don't know that. They can't know that.

Aside from the very real risk of nuclear escalation, we have placed the strictest sanctions in history on Russia with no clear off-ramps or criteria for lifting them.

What is clear is that broad-based sanctions will be devastating for civilians. What is less clear is that Putin or

his inner circle will be hurt or deterred by them. As Secretary Albright told me in a committee in 2019: "We have learned that comprehensive sanctions . . . hurt the people."

Collective punishment is a moral evil, especially when it is authorized with no end in sight. The embargo in Cuba has been in place for over 60 years. It has caused incredible human suffering. It has not produced its intended outcome.

Maximum pressure sanctions on Iran and Venezuela have made it hard for people living in those countries to buy food and medicine, but it has done nothing to weaken their governments.

We also know that there are a number of countries who depend on Russia and Ukraine for their food supplies. Russia and Ukraine produce one-third of the world's wheat. Already, there are reports their countries are refusing to export their own food supplies for fear of a shrinking supply.

There is a very real chance that this war and our sanctions could lead to famine in places like Sudan, which imports half of its wheat from Russia. The Russian people did not choose this war, and the Sudanese people certainly did not. Our policies should not punish them.

I don't support broad-based sanctions on any country, adversary, or ally. They are economic warfare, and we should all oppose them like we oppose military actions.

□ 1045

Madam Speaker, this war was sparked by greed, imperialism, and dehumanization. We must lead with humanity. Let us stand with not just the people of Ukraine who are giving their lives fighting off a cruel war of conquest, but also the brave Russian dissidents who are risking their own lives to stand up to Putin.

Let's stand for a world where the rule of law is respected, human rights abusers face justice, and we see each other first and foremost as fellow humans.

Madam Speaker, I pray for wisdom. I pray for justice. Above all, I pray for peace.

#### CONGRATULATING THE BEARDEN HIGH SCHOOL LADY BULLDOGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BURCHETT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Bearden High School Lady Bulldogs basketball team for winning their first Tennessee Secondary School Athletic Association title in program history. Bearden won the Class 4A State championship game on March 12, defeating the Farragut Lady Admirals 52-34.

Both teams reached the State tournament after a season's worth of perseverance and teamwork. The Lady Bulldogs compiled 36 wins during the regular season while the Lady Admirals

won 39 games. In the State tournament, Bearden and Farragut sailed through the quarterfinals and semifinals to set up a clash with each other in the championship game. It was the fifth time these two teams met during the season.

This was a historic matchup, Madam Speaker. Neither Bearden nor Farragut had appeared in a girls' State championship game before that. It also marked the first time two Knox County schools competed against each other in the State championship game. Regardless of the winner of this game, Knox County would have its first girls' basketball State championship team since the Austin-East Roadrunners won it all in 2007.

As a Bearden High School alumnus, I am excited that my Lady Bulldogs were victorious in the championship, but I represent both these communities in Congress. The Lady Admirals should be proud of what they achieved this year, and I am happy to recognize Farragut for an incredibly successful season. Both squads did an excellent job representing east Tennessee in the State tournament. Congratulations to the girls and their coaches. Go, Bulldogs.

#### CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE'S BASKETBALL PROGRAMS

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate the University of Tennessee's basketball programs on making their respective 2022 NCAA tournaments. By punching their tickets to the big dance, both the men's and women's teams built on UT athletics' long history of college basketball success.

The University of Tennessee is the only school to qualify for every women's NCAA tournament. The women's program is making its 40th straight—40th straight, Madam Speaker—NCAA tournament appearance after winning 23 contests during the regular season. Competing as the number four seed in the Wichita region, the Lady Volunteers won't need to travel far for their first game of the tournament. Thompson-Boling Arena will host it in Knoxville. This venue will be the first for this year's competition, which is where the Lady Volunteers will take on the Buffalo Bulls on March 19.

On the men's side, the Volunteers defeated the Texas A&M Aggies last Saturday to win the 2022 Southeastern Conference tournament championship. It is not in my notes, but I do want to note, since Representative BARR might be watching this, we also defeated Kentucky very handily also. This is the fifth tournament championship in program history and the first since 1979. The team earned the number three seed in the South Region for its regular season performance and faces the Longwood Lancers in the first round this afternoon in Indianapolis, Indiana.

I wish the best of luck to the Lady Volunteers head coach Kellie Harper and the Volunteers men's head coach Rick Barnes, all their players, coaches,

and support staff as they compete in this year's NCAA's basketball tournament. I was also an alumnus of the University of Tennessee, and I still have 4 years of eligibility left in basketball. Go Vols.

#### BUDDY'S BAR-B-Q CELEBRATES 50 YEARS

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise to celebrate the 50th anniversary of Buddy's Bar-b-q, a local favorite in east Tennessee, and one of my local favorites as well. My mama and daddy and I always used to eat there after church on Sundays. It was always delicious. I ate there with my best friend Chris Heagerty last week, and it was still delicious, and it was very price conscious, I will say. It is not too expensive.

Buddy and LaMuriel Smothers dreamed of opening a restaurant that served quality, homestyle barbecue with classic southern hospitality. In 1972, they made that dream a reality by opening the first Buddy's Bar-b-q in Knoxville. It quickly became a hit. Crowds packed into the restaurant to enjoy LaMuriel's delicious recipes, which are still on the menu today, and listen to the wonderful bluegrass bands that played on Friday nights. I remember a band called Knoxville Grass used to play there, and I would sing a little bit of the tunes here, but I don't want to run everybody off or be called out.

Ten years later, of course, Buddy's Bar-b-q was featured at the 1982 World's Fair in Knoxville, where I worked at the always very loud and impressive video expo. After appearing at the fair, though, the word spread far and wide that Buddy's Bar-b-q was outstanding. The restaurant became a barbecue staple in Tennessee, a reputation that it has maintained for the past 40 years.

Complementing the outstanding food at Buddy's Bar-b-q are the restaurant's charitable efforts in our community. The restaurant launched Buddy's Race for the Cure to honor Buddy after he died of cancer in 1992 and supports Alzheimer's Tennessee in honor of LaMuriel. It also hosts Mission Mondays and supports local schools, regional nonprofits, and the University of Tennessee. Additionally, Buddy's Bar-b-q will provide catering and support for the Congressional Medal of Honor Society's annual gathering to honor all the living Medal of Honor recipients. This event is again being held in Knoxville this year for the second time, and Buddy's will provide classic southern hospitality.

I congratulate the entire Smothers family; my good friends Anthony and Lisa Edwards, Mark and Jaime Lemoncelli; and everyone involved in making Buddy's Bar-b-q a wonderful success these past 50 years. It is good. If you all ever get to Knoxville, please stop in.

### SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, Vladimir Putin's horrific war against the Ukrainian people has all of us talking about how to prevent him and other oil-rich autocrats like him from being able to afford to commit these heinous acts in the future. It has also, all of a sudden, made everybody in this town an energy expert. I am here to set the record straight about a few things.

One, Russia is a petrostate. Fossil fuels are funding Putin's war crimes against the Ukrainian people. Fossil fuels are funding Putin's assault on democracy. Fossil fuels are funding the demise of post-World War II stability in Europe. Putin's power comes from fossil fuels and our world's dependence on them.

Two, you cannot end an addiction by increasing the supply. No amount of increased fossil fuel extraction in the United States, which, I should note, would take years, can take away Russia's influence on the global energy market. Since fossil fuels are a global commodity, as long as we depend on them, Americans will continue to be subject to wild price fluctuations based on the whims of petro-dictators.

Three, when the fossil fuel industry and the conservative politicians they bankroll go on television claiming the solution to the pain you are feeling at the pump today is to drill more in the U.S., they are lying to you. They are lying in a cynical attempt to take advantage of a tragic situation to line their own pocketbooks. You deserve the truth.

The truth is that there is only one long-term solution to stop funding oil-rich autocrats and insulate Americans from energy price inflation: Double down on our transition to cleaner, cheaper, domestically produced renewable energy and energy efficiency.

The horror that we are seeing in Ukraine makes it abundantly clear that clean energy isn't just necessary to protect against climate devastation. Preventing wars and protecting our national security demands investments in clean energy. American energy independence demands investments in clean energy. Lowering costs demands investments in clean energy.

Every day we fail to reach an agreement on the baseline climate investments that were passed in the House is a day that Americans pay the price at the pumps and oil-rich autocrats profit.

That is why I have led nearly 90 of my House colleagues in calling on President Biden to lead a climate restart to reconciliation negotiations centering the cost-saving clean energy investments as the path forward to deliver tangible results to the American people. This is a code red moment, and it cannot wait any longer.

### SUPPORTING WOMEN WHO ARE SEXUALLY ABUSED

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, sexual assault is common among female students of all ages, races, and ethnicities. On college campuses, one in five women in college experience a sexual assault. Studies show that students are at the highest risk of sexual assault in the first few months of their first and second semesters in college.

This is unacceptable. Every woman everywhere has the right to live free from abuse. This is why it was so important to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, and I am proud that we finally passed that reauthorization into law in our omnibus package.

But we also have to ensure that women who are at risk have trained, trusted professionals who they can reach out to when they are at risk. That is why I was pleased to introduce, and see included in the final package, my amendment to ensure that appropriate campus faculty, such as academic advisers or professionals who deal with students on a daily basis, are trained to recognize victims of sexual and domestic violence. We have to ensure that our campuses are equipped with the tools and knowledge to combat violence against women.

If you are sexually assaulted, your experience is valid. It is not your fault, and you are not alone. Please know there is a community of people ready and willing to believe you, trust you, and support you.

### TRADING IN INDIVIDUAL STOCKS BY CONGRESSIONAL STAFF AND MEMBERS

Mr. CASTEN. Madam Speaker, there is an iron rule of investing: unless you are Warren Buffet or have access to insider information, you won't make money trying to outsmart the market. Invest in mutual funds and index funds to build your wealth.

And yet, according to a recent New York Times article, Members of Congress are not only buying and selling a lot of individual stocks, but we consistently outperform the market.

I don't see Warren Buffet here nor do I see a lot of people with long track records of successful stock picking before they came to Congress, but I do see a lot of people with access to a lot of inside information, who know when we are about to change our defense contracts or invest in domestic semiconductor capacity, update our anti-trust laws, or buy vaccines, and have the ability to trade on that inside information.

Our responsibilities as Members of Congress are a trust from the voters. Ethics matters. That is why I don't personally own or trade individual stocks, and I encourage every Member of Congress to stop trading stocks immediately. Even the appearance of impropriety by one Member cheapens us all.

That is why I am a proud cosponsor of the Ban Conflicted Trading Act, which would bar Members of Congress

and senior congressional staff from buying or selling individual stocks and other investments and from serving on any corporate boards while in office.

We owe it to the American people to pass that bill and sign it into law.

### AMERICA'S ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address America's energy crisis and the administration's continued assault on American-made energy that has killed jobs, increased our dependency on foreign oil, and most recently jeopardized our national security.

Just 1 year ago, our country was comfortably meeting our energy needs, and we were a net exporter of energy for the first time in 50 years. However, under this administration's leadership or lack thereof, we have dramatically increased our dependence on foreign oil, sent gas prices sky high, and increased heating bills during the winter.

Instead of turning to America's own energy sector to meet our energy needs and continue to make us independent, this administration is asking countries like Iran and Venezuela to compensate for the ban on Russian imports and ignoring American energy producers.

In doing so, the administration is prioritizing oil produced by dictators over American energy producers who support jobs and businesses here at home.

I urge the administration to flip the switch and reduce our dependence on foreign energy by increasing production of oil and gas at home. We can do this.

### MODERNIZING AND STREAMLINING DIAGNOSTIC TESTING

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to legislation that I have been working on with the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) called the VALID Act, a bipartisan, bicameral solution to modernize and streamline diagnostic testing through establishing a risk-based framework for review and approval of laboratory-developed tests or in vitro diagnostic tests.

Many of you might be thinking, why does this matter? Well, let me tell you. Right now in America, laboratory-developed tests are not regulated for clinical or analytical accuracy. This is a problem. CMS and FDA have both told us that this is so. They do not regulate these tests.

Every single day there is a new story of inaccuracy of these diagnostic tests that can be life changing and life altering with severe consequences. As a doctor, it breaks my heart to hear of situations where, for example, a young woman falsely tests positive for a potential risk for cancer, takes preventive action to save her life potentially,



an irreversible action that might prevent her from ever having more children, only to find out that the test was falsely positive and inaccurate.

A recent article in The New York Times outlined the inaccuracy of some prenatal diagnostic blood tests, which were very inaccurate. This may lead to potential life-changing medical decisions based on these false results. It is absolutely devastating.

If passed, the VALID Act would protect patients and save lives by ensuring Americans can rely on the test results they receive while also allowing leading-edge development and innovation to thrive in our hospitals and laboratories.

□ 1100

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF KATHY J. SACKMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in memory of Kathy J. Sackman, a pioneer in the labor movement, as well as a registered nurse and founder of the United Nurses Association of California/Union of Healthcare Professionals.

I had the honor of serving with Kathy when I was her political director for a number of years, and she was a nurse's nurse. She was a frontline nurse who worked in critical care units and saw that the adverse treatment of nurses led to worse outcomes for patients. She started in Pittsburgh and then moved to California, and she was a registered nurse in Fontana.

I asked Kathy simply one day, why did you start the United Nurses Association of California/Union of Healthcare Professionals? And she said simply, I saw that the nurses were being treated very differently, very differently than the doctors. We didn't even have dental, and they did. She said, it seemed small then, but it was something big because it represented just the fact that nurses, people that work in healthcare, didn't even get the proper benefits that they deserved. So they decided to organize.

That organization now is 32,000 strong, representing not only registered nurses but also nurse midwives. It is something that she left a living legacy that will continue for years to come.

One of the things that we tried to remind people, she told me, is that the wins that we have achieved tend to be forgotten over the years; that the pay for nurses; that the staffing ratio for nurses; that the way nurses are viewed today has always been so. And she said that that was not always the case. And that is why they fought to organize, they fought for their patients.

But she also understood that if you don't treat the nurses well, then the patients are not treated well. If you have 10 patients for one nurse, well,

there is no way that those patients can get the quality care that they deserve. So she led, as well as other nurses, for the fight for staffing ratios in California that have improved the outcomes for patients across not only southern California, where she started the Nurses Union, but throughout the entire State and the country.

One of the things that she was always proud of is that she always put members first, nurses first, the community first, the hospital first because she knew if the hospital did well, that the nurses would do well. If the nurses do well, patients do well. So this is something that was impressive.

Quick story: She reorganized a hospital, nurses at a particular hospital. And when we opened up the hospital's books, they were flat broke. Every night a creditor would swipe their bank accounts, take all the money that was owed to them, and they would never have enough money to put into patient care or to keep them whole.

So she made an agreement with the nurses; we are going to help save this hospital. She worked with the parent union of this union called AFSCME International, a Republican Member of Congress, a Democratic Senator, to get the bridge funding necessary to help that hospital stay afloat. It was a safety net hospital; and told them that once we get that hospital stabilized, their finances are better, and we can get your raise, then you will be pay more dues. At that point, they were only paying \$5 in dues. That is unheard of. But that is because she knew that in the end you had to get that hospital to a place that was financially stable; that was stable for the patient; and was stable for the people that worked there.

In the end, she helped save a hospital that was in a low-income community. It was a working-class community and the community that I grew up in, Riverside, California.

She will always have a lasting legacy as long as we continue to fight for patients, for nurses, and for our communities.

Madam Speaker, I just want to also mention that she is survived by two sons, Monty and Michael, and an extended family.

#### WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise to honor three incredible women from central Washington.

Shannon Polson of the Methow Valley became one of the first women combat pilots in the U.S. military. After graduating from the University of Alaska ROTC, she was commissioned as an Army aviator and was one of the first women to fly the Apache attack

helicopter. She served two tours as an Apache platoon leader, and one as a company commander, deploying to three continents.

Kathy Bryson of Richland is the Pacific Northwest disaster response coordinator for the United Methodist Church. Kathy has provided the overall leadership for recovery from fire disasters in Okanogan and Whitman Counties over the last 2 years, as well as for the wildfire disasters in Oregon and northern California.

Kayla Barron of Richland was not only a member of the first class of women commissioned into the submarine community for the U.S. Navy as a submarine warfare officer, but is currently serving as mission specialist of the NASA SpaceX Crew-3 mission to the International Space Station. In fact, just yesterday morning, she successfully completed a spacewalk. She has accomplished much since graduating from Richland High, and you can bet that we are all rooting for her every step of the way.

These women exemplify the very best of central Washington: Service to community, determination, integrity, and grit. They have paved the way for women in our communities and across the world. Their stories are an inspiration for all of us in central Washington, and it is a privilege to honor them during Women's History Month.

#### CONGRATULATING JARED BALCOM

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to congratulate National Potato Council's newly elected president, and fellow central Washingtonian, Mr. Jared Balcom.

Jared is the owner of a fourth-generation potato growing and fresh packing company, Balcom & Moe, based in Pasco, Washington, so he knows firsthand the challenges our central Washington producers face and how to best address them.

I have had the pleasure of working with and getting to know Jared over the years and know that he is well-equipped to advocate for the potato farmers who provide so many jobs and boost our local economy.

Congratulations, Jared, on this new role. I look forward to continuing to work together to advance our shared goals of modernizing water infrastructure, improving trade agreements, supporting agricultural research, and fixing our agricultural labor crisis.

#### HONORING THE SERVICE OF CLIFTON MALM

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to honor one of central Washington's veterans, Clifton Malm of Omak.

Clifton served our country honorably as a helicopter pilot in Vietnam and risked his life to protect his fellow servicemembers. His courage earned him a Purple Heart which, unfortunately, he never received until just now. While it may be just a small piece of metal, it represents what I believe is the gratitude of a truly thankful Nation.

Clifton, thank you for your service and for your continued dedication to



the United States of America. Your story is a reminder to all of us of the sacrifices the men and women in our Armed Forces make every single day.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia) at noon.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Be Thou our vision, O Lord of our hearts.  
Nothing else matters to us, save that You are.

You are our best thought, by day or by night.

Waking or sleeping, Your presence our light.  
Be Thou our wisdom, Yours our true word.  
We ever with You, and You with us, Lord.  
You and You always, first in our heart.  
O, king of glory, our treasure Thou art.  
In You, O Lord, is any victory won.  
Rule in us, reign in us, Thy will be done.  
Heart of our own hearts, whatever befall.  
Still be our vision, O Ruler of all.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CROW led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### RECOGNIZING JEWISH FAMILY SERVICES

(Mr. CROW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CROW. Madam Speaker, it is my honor today to recognize Jewish Family Services and join them in celebrating their 150th anniversary.

From their founding in 1872, Jewish Family Services has always adapted to meet the moment time and time again. They helped resettle Holocaust survivors in the wake of World War II, opened a group home for individuals with disabilities in the 1980s, and formed an employment services department in 2021.

In the last year alone, Jewish Family Services helped over 25,000 individuals stand strong against COVID-19 and even became a temporary Afghan refugee resettlement agency for Afghans looking to start new lives in the Denver metro area.

For 150 years, our community has been made a better and more inclusive place to live because of the thousands of volunteers who have pulled upon their faith to serve our community and improve the lives of others.

I congratulate and thank Jewish Family Services for their service to our community and look forward to what the next 150 years will bring.

### PRESIDENT ZELENSKY'S MESSAGE TO RUSSIAN TROOPS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, during a Monday address to the Ukrainian people, President Volodymyr Zelenskyy made a direct appeal to soldiers of Russia, asking: "... why should you die?"

Zelensky said: "We hear what you really think about this senseless war ... ." Then telling those who surrender: "... we will treat you the way people are supposed to be treated" and "... not how you are being treated in your army."

Today, Putin declared war on the Russian people. His call for self-cleansing is a repeat of the murderous Stalinists purges leading to Soviet Socialist nonpersons who disappeared.

Today, I will be offering legislation for expedited refugee status to America for defecting members of the Duma, diplomatic personnel, and Russian Government officials.

This reinforces the bipartisan legislation for Russian military defectors for expedited refugee status to America. The defectors who turn over equipment to Ukraine will receive up to \$100,000.

I also have a bill in Congress for a bust of President Zelenskyy to be placed in the U.S. Capitol.

God bless Ukraine. God save Ukraine. Long live President Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

### HONORING GEORGE NETTELS

(Mr. LATURNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATURNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of George Nettels. A Pittsburg, Kansas, native and U.S. Army veteran, George attended Pittsburg High School, graduated from the University of Kansas, had a successful career in the private sector, and went on to serve as the chair of the Kansas Republican Party.

At a time when many Americans in their fifties would start to slow down, George was just speeding up. George and his wife, Josie, lived a full life of travel and adventure and raised a beautiful family. To top it all off, at the age of 84, George joined his grandson Jack in a 10,000-foot tandem jump.

Beyond teaching me important lessons about being grateful for those that help you, George has personally inspired me and many others to live a life of service to others. That is what George did. Whether it was the community of Pittsburg, southeast Kansas, the State of Kansas, or our great Nation, George put the well-being of others before himself.

### INFLATION'S IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas. Madam Speaker, rising gas prices and skyrocketing inflation are having major impacts on small businesses. In Hico, Texas, Mark Chapman of the Chapman Cattle Company said it best: "We see smaller revenue and return on our products when the prices of gas increase, and it may be the death of small businesses, ranchers, and farmers, as we know it."

Chapman Cattle Company is one of the many small businesses that are struggling to keep up with record-high gas prices due to President Biden's anti-energy agenda.

Democrats continue to ignore Main Street's plea to get gas prices down and inflation under control. Small businesses weathered tough economic conditions throughout the pandemic only to be met with Biden's Green New Deal agenda that threatens everybody in all communities forever.

I will continue to fight for small businesses, work to get the government out of our lives, and let the free market compete and do great things.

In God we trust.

### RECOGNIZING DR. GREGORY WILLIAMS

(Mr. PFLUGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PFLUGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize a dedicated leader in the Permian Basin, Odessa College president Dr. Gregory Williams.

Dr. Williams began his educational career in 1983 as a student at Odessa College, later attending the University

of Texas Permian Basin, then earning his doctorate in higher education from Baylor University. In 2007, Dr. Williams returned to the Permian Basin to serve as president of Odessa College.

His impressive career has garnered local, State, and national attention. As both the chairman of the Texas Association of Community Colleges and as a member of the board of directors and the executive board of the American Association of Community Colleges, he continuously dedicates his time for the advocacy of community colleges and underrepresented communities.

Thanks to Dr. Williams' stewardship, Odessa College has become one of the most impactful educational institutions in the Nation. Not only did his leadership earn Odessa College national recognition as a top-ranked community college, but his tenure as president saw enrollment increase by 35 percent and the number of degrees awarded by an incredible 197 percent.

I thank my colleague from Illinois for also representing the achievements of Dr. Williams. He is a fierce advocate of community colleges. I speak for the entire community in sincerely thanking Dr. Williams for his commitment to the Permian Basin and to higher education.

#### ENDING MASK MANDATES ON PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

(Mr. HUIZENGA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand a vote on H.J. Res. 72, a Congressional Review Act resolution that would end the CDC's mask mandate for airlines, trains, buses, and other public transportation hubs.

Tuesday night, the Senate voted in a rare bipartisan manner to end these mandates in what even CNN called a "bipartisan rebuke of Biden administration policy."

States and cities, big and small, across the country have ended or are in the process of ending their mask mandates at schools, basketball games, and even crowded restaurants.

Thousands of fans will pack arenas in the coming days to cheer on their teams during March Madness. At these games, they rightly won't be required to wear a mask. But as soon as they step onto a plane, a bus, a train, or even a metro, unelected bureaucrats, at the direction of President Biden, have decreed that masks must be put on and must be worn.

It is past time for this unscientific mask mandate to end. I am calling on Speaker PELOSI to hold a vote on repealing this mask mandate. Americans want their lives back, and it is time to vote.

#### FOCUS ON AMERICA FIRST

(Mrs. GREENE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to address the House to discuss why we need to focus on our country first. We are seeing rapidly rising inflation. It is completely out of control.

While here in Congress and in the Washington bubble, which is disconnected with the rest of America, all we are hearing is potential war with Russia over the country of Ukraine. Ukraine is not a NATO member ally, and President Biden had told them that we would be only standing with our NATO member allies.

All we are hearing on the news is Ukraine. Yet, here in America, what real Americans care about are gas prices they can't afford, inflation that goes up and up to where grocery bills are unaffordable, and they are very concerned about our out-of-control, open border.

Crime is out of control, yet Washington is completely disconnected and seems to care more about sending our sons and daughters to a potential war where they do not belong.

I urge my colleagues here in Congress, instead of working on a future COVID bill, spending billions of dollars on COVID that doesn't exist, let's care about our border and let's care about working to have energy independence to lower gas prices for Americans.

#### CONGRATULATING THE BELLARMINE KNIGHTS

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the best college basketball team not in a bracket this weekend. The Bellarmine Knights did what no team has done before, winning a Division I championship just 2 years removed from Division II, a title that should come with a big dance invitation.

Instead, this Cinderella story was cut short by an NCAA which, as it often does, played wicked stepmother, upholding a bizarre rule preventing teams elevating too quickly from Division II to championship contender.

Who they think they are serving, I don't know, but they cannot take away the Knights' extraordinary achievements or the pride they brought their school and hometown. They entered the season as afterthoughts and finished as ASUN champions and just the tenth team since 2007 to win 20 games against a top-5 schedule.

This incredible feat for the players is a triumph for Coach Scotty Davenport, who has won championships in Louisville for 35 years at every level and seems like he could for 35 more.

Scotty noted that each season ends with just two teams left standing, the NCAA and NIT champs. This year, the season ends with three. Please join me in honoring the Bellarmine Knights, the first NCAA team to finish this basketball season as champions.

□ 1215

#### FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT OF 2022

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 979, I call up the bill (H.R. 963) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 979, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-34 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 963

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act of 2022" or the "FAIR Act of 2022".*

#### SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

*The purposes of this Act are to—*

(1) prohibit predispute arbitration agreements that force arbitration of future employment, consumer, antitrust, or civil rights disputes; and  
(2) prohibit agreements and practices that interfere with the right of individuals, workers, and small businesses to participate in a joint, class, or collective action related to an employment, consumer, antitrust, or civil rights dispute.

#### SEC. 3. ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT, CONSUMER, ANTITRUST, AND CIVIL RIGHTS DISPUTES.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### "CHAPTER 5—ARBITRATION OF EMPLOYMENT, CONSUMER, ANTITRUST, AND CIVIL RIGHTS DISPUTES

"Sec.

"501. Definitions.

"502. No validity or enforceability.

#### "§ 501. Definitions

"In this chapter—

"(1) the term 'antitrust dispute' means a dispute—

"(A) arising from an alleged violation of the antitrust laws (as defined in subsection (a) of the first section of the Clayton Act) or State antitrust laws; and

"(B) in which the plaintiffs seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law;

"(2) the term 'civil rights dispute' means a dispute—

"(A) arising from an alleged violation of—

"(i) the Constitution of the United States or the constitution of a State;

"(ii) any Federal, State, or local law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, sex, age, gender identity, sexual orientation, disability, religion, national origin, or any legally protected status in education, employment, credit, housing, public accommodations and facilities, voting, veterans or servicemembers, health care, or a program funded or conducted by the Federal Government or State government, including any law referred to or described in section 62(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including parts of such law not explicitly referenced in such section but that relate to protecting individuals on any such basis; and

“(B) in which at least one party alleging a violation described in subparagraph (A) is one or more individuals (or their authorized representative), including one or more individuals seeking certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law;

“(3) the term ‘consumer dispute’ means a dispute between—

“(A) one or more individuals who seek or acquire real or personal property, services (including services related to digital technology), securities or other investments, money, or credit for personal, family, or household purposes including an individual or individuals who seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or a comparable rule or provision of State law; and

“(B)(i) the seller or provider of such property, services, securities or other investments, money, or credit; or

“(ii) a third party involved in the selling, providing of, payment for, receipt or use of information about, or other relationship to any such property, services, securities or other investments, money, or credit;

“(4) the term ‘employment dispute’ means a dispute between one or more individuals (or their authorized representative) and a person arising out of or related to the work relationship or prospective work relationship between them, including a dispute regarding the terms of or payment for, advertising of, recruiting for, referring of, arranging for, or discipline or discharge in connection with, such work, regardless of whether the individual is or would be classified as an employee or an independent contractor with respect to such work, and including a dispute arising under any law referred to or described in section 62(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, including parts of such law not explicitly referenced in such section but that relate to protecting individuals on any such basis, and including a dispute in which an individual or individuals seek certification as a class under rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or as a collective action under section 16(b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act, or a comparable rule or provision of State law;

“(5) the term ‘predispute arbitration agreement’ means an agreement to arbitrate a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement; and

“(6) the term ‘predispute joint-action waiver’ means an agreement, whether or not part of a predispute arbitration agreement, that would prohibit, or waive the right of, one of the parties to the agreement to participate in a joint, class, or collective action in a judicial, arbitral, administrative, or other forum, concerning a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

#### “§502. No validity or enforceability

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to an employment dispute, consumer dispute, antitrust dispute, or civil rights dispute.

“(b) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An issue as to whether this chapter applies with respect to a dispute shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court, rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the party resisting arbitration challenges the arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement, and irrespective of whether the agreement purports to delegate such determinations to an arbitrator.

“(2) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this chapter shall apply to any arbitration provision in a contract between an em-

ployer and a labor organization or between labor organizations, except that no such arbitration provision shall have the effect of waiving the right of a worker to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended—

(A) in section 1 by striking “of seamen,” and all that follows through “interstate commerce” and inserting in its place “of individuals, regardless of whether such individuals are designated as employees or independent contractors for other purposes”;

(B) in section 2 by striking “chapter 4” and inserting “chapter 4 or 5”;

(C) in section 208 by striking “chapter 4” and inserting “chapter 4 or 5”; and

(D) in section 307 by striking “chapter 4” and inserting “chapter 4 or 5”.

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters of title 9 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“5. Arbitration of Employment, Consumer, Antitrust, and Civil Rights Disputes ..... 501”.

#### SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this act, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after such date.

#### SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed to prohibit the use of arbitration on a voluntary basis after the dispute arises.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in House Report 117-273, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the same time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 963.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 963, the Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act, or the FAIR Act, is critical legislation that would restore access to justice for

millions of Americans who are currently locked out of the court system and are forced to settle their disputes against companies in a private system of arbitration that is often skewed in the company's favor over the individual.

Private arbitration has been transformed, by 40 years of reckless Supreme Court decisions, from a voluntary forum for companies to resolve commercial disputes into a legal nightmare for millions of consumers, employees, and others who are forced into arbitration and are unable to enforce certain fundamental rights in court.

By burying a forced arbitration clause deep in the fine print of take-it-or-leave-it consumer and employment contracts, companies can evade the court system, where plaintiffs have far greater legal protections, and hide wrongdoing behind a one-sided process that is tilted in their favor.

For example, arbitration generally limits discovery; does not adhere to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; can prohibit class actions, which it almost always does; and deny the right of appeal. Worse yet, arbitration allows the proceedings, and often even the results, to stay secret, thereby permitting companies to avoid public scrutiny of potential misconduct.

For millions of workers and consumers, the precondition, whether they know it or not, of obtaining a basic service or product, such as a bank account, a cell phone, a credit card, or even a job, is that they must sign a nonnegotiable contract that includes a provision requiring all disputes to be resolved in private arbitration.

These take-it-or-leave-it contracts, which were once clearly disfavored under the law, now seem to have been blessed by the Supreme Court as standard operating procedure in the corporate world.

That means for millions of people, the ability to enforce consumer, labor, antitrust, and civil rights laws are subject to the whims of a private arbitrator, often selected by the companies themselves.

These private arbitrators are not required to provide plaintiffs any of the fundamental protections guaranteed in the courts, and their further employment can depend on building a good reputation with the companies that hire them. Unsurprisingly, arbitration has become a virtual get-out-of-jail-free card many companies use to circumvent the basic rights of consumers and workers.

The FAIR Act reverses this disastrous trend by prohibiting the enforcement of forced arbitration clauses in consumer, labor, antitrust, and civil rights disputes.

Importantly, this legislation does not preclude both parties from agreeing to arbitrate a claim after a dispute arises. It does, however, protect unsuspecting consumers and employees from being forced to give up their right to seek justice in court.

Last month, Congress came together in a bipartisan fashion to prohibit forced arbitration clauses in suits concerning sexual harassment and sexual assault. Watching that legislation be signed into law was a proud moment for many of us in this Chamber. This bill simply extends the same basic fairness in that bill to other workers and consumers.

That bipartisan bill, which gathered, as I recall, about 130 Republican votes, is exactly the same as this bill, only limited in its application.

Every argument for that bill is an argument for this bill. This bill simply extends the same basic fairness in that bill, as I said, to other workers and consumers.

I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for his leadership on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this vital legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 963. There is nothing fair about the FAIR Act. The bill would undermine Americans' freedom to contract; burden the judicial system, both Federal and in all States in the country; and restrict access to justice.

This bill would ban arbitration agreements across nearly all contracts. It outlaws arbitration agreements in employment disputes, consumer disputes, antitrust disputes, and civil rights disputes. It outlaws arbitration agreements with respect to not only big, huge corporations but the most humble businesses and parties in the country, those that I served in my law practice.

Democrats propose that arbitration is bad for Americans, but it has been a fixture of our legal landscape for almost 100 years. They claim that arbitration is forced. Both of their claims are wrong.

Arbitration has many benefits. It is more efficient and faster than going to court. The rules are not nearly as arcane. Injured parties get their relief sooner, and they spend less money along the way.

Plaintiffs in employment and consumer disputes, according to studies, actually win more in arbitration than they do in court. They get more money in arbitration. They win more often in arbitration.

Democrats know that arbitration has plenty of benefits. How do you know this? Because in this very bill, Democrats have carved out their union friends from the mandates of this bill.

In other words, if the bill becomes law, powerful unions, and no one else, can still use these valuable agreements vis-a-vis individuals.

This carve-out also tells us that Democrats know there is no such thing as forced arbitration. Agreements that are truly forced are already illegal under existing law in every State in the country.

People are no more forced to agree to an arbitration provision than they are to agree to any other provision of a contract. The bill, instead, bans private parties from knowingly and willingly agreeing on a process to resolve future disputes. It tells Americans, no matter how informed or sophisticated they may be, that they can't be trusted to manage their own relationships by agreeing in advance to the means of resolution to be used in the event of a dispute.

Our Democrat colleagues seem to believe that Americans can't be trusted to think for themselves. Big Government needs to tell them what to do. Their freedom to contract should be restricted by the wisdom from Washington.

Democrats argue that this bill is no big deal because parties can still decide to use arbitration after a dispute arises, but that never happens in practice for much the same reason that many disputes go to court and are resolved outside of a jury. About 1 to 2 percent actually go all the way.

The decision to get into a lawsuit is not always purely rational, taken from all points of view, and is often affected by tempers that are different once the dispute has arisen than when the parties are considering a position of cool judgment in advance.

Their incentives change after a dispute has arisen, and people will pick a strategy to resolve that dispute at that time. They won't necessarily be looking for a process, then, that is good for both parties for many reasons.

When you are immersed in a dispute, there is also a greater chance that a lawyer that you may have retained would have an incentive to direct you in the direction of litigation rather than arbitration, and those incentives certainly won't necessarily be consistent with a faster and cheaper alternative.

Rather than helping the little guy stand up to big companies, this bill would take the option to arbitrate off the table for everybody and put more money in the pockets of trial lawyers, most especially plaintiffs' class action trial lawyers.

The bill would force more people into court. They will pay more and possibly recover less. But it would also force some people out of the justice system altogether.

Some people will be unable to pay for an expensive lawsuit, or they may have a claim so small that it is only practicable for them to bring it themselves, which arbitration facilitates.

Let's be clear, too. The surge in new lawsuits hurts employment. It hurts businesses and keeps them from being able to afford to hire more people. It will raise their costs at the worst possible time, when they are already dealing with supply chain problems and record inflation caused by failed Democrat policies, and not only by prohibiting the use of arbitration going forward but by retroactively eliminating

it, rendering it null and void in millions of contracts already outstanding right now, at this point in the life of our Nation, when we have 8 percent inflation, another constraint on the supply chain imposed by Democrat policies.

Everyone should be sounding the alarm on this blatant overreach. At the end of the day, this bill curries favor with the plaintiffs' bar and union bosses, and it does so at the expense of hardworking Americans and small businesses, especially.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 963, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1230

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to correct something Mr. BISHOP said. This bill does not ban arbitration. It bans forced arbitration. It bans the practice or the enforceability of the practice of having a provision in a contract that you sign to buy anything or an employment contract where you are forced, that is there and that if you try to change it, they won't sell you the car, they won't sell you the cell phone, they won't hire you, so you have no choice, and that forced arbitration removes the constitutional right to a trial by jury.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, this morning I went to a breakfast where I heard the thoughts of Miss Sheila Bair. Miss Bair is a Republican. She describes herself as a Midwest Republican who worked on Senator Dole's staff for 8 years. She is a former assistant secretary of the Treasury and a former head of the FDIC under Republican Presidents.

She said specifically the problems with inflation in this country are worldwide. They are the supply chain, which is worldwide, caused by the pandemic in China and other problems. They are worldwide. So any more of this rhetoric about Biden and his problems with the supply chain, it is not Biden; it is a worldwide problem.

The same thing for the price of oil. Yesterday, in Judiciary Committee we heard someone say it is Biden's fault that the price of oil has gone up. The price of oil is a worldwide market. President Biden's actions do not affect the worldwide market. It is supply and demand. We need to not hear these canards.

And the same for this bill. This is, as Mr. NADLER said, forced arbitration. Mr. JOHNSON has been working on this for years, and I compliment him on his work and his success. This gives consumers a chance to get their cases heard and to get a rightful judgment, not be forced to take an arbitration that is almost always entirely pro-business.

This is the difference between Republicans and Democrats. Democrats look out for people, people who have had injustice done to them and look for a way to correct it and give them equity. Republicans look to business, who caused the harm, and try to defend them and keep their pockets full.

I support the bill. All American consumers would support the bill. I urge its passage.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished chairman of the committee offered to correct me by saying that the bill only prohibits forced arbitration, said that was a correction, as if I misspoke as to facts.

Let me read from the language of the bill: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to an employment dispute, consumer dispute, antitrust dispute, or civil rights dispute."

The word "forced" was not in that language, Madam Speaker. It prohibits all predispute arbitration agreements and post-joint action waivers.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank my gracious colleague for yielding, though we do not hold the same position on this piece of legislation.

Madam Speaker, when our fellow Americans get a cell phone contract, when they get cable, when they get internet, they are subject to forced arbitration. Virtually every single American lives under a forced arbitration provision today, and most do not know it.

Do we really think that people have the ability to go negotiate against AT&T or Comcast or in many cases big businesses that employ a great deal of Americans? Of course, they don't.

And so what that means is that we have a two-tier system of dispute resolution. Regular folks get to show up at Article III courts the taxpayers fund to resolve their disputes, and meanwhile oftentimes big business gets a concierge lane to be able to resolve matters in their favor and oftentimes to preclude the resolution of a matter at all.

Think about instances of wage theft where big businesses can take just a little bit of money and not pay their employees. Well, an individual employee would have a very hard time getting a lawyer and making a case on that, and so they need the class action tool to be able to get redress for their grievances. The forced arbitration provisions that impair so many of our fellow Americans limit that class action tool, and then people end up getting really screwed in the process.

I support the legislation. I am proud to be the Republican lead, and it is my belief that if Article III courts funded by the taxpayers are good enough for the rest of us, they ought to be good

enough for big business. I thank the gentleman for his indulgence.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Florida, and as I suggested earlier, if the bill were a matter only of big businesses, it would be a very different bill, but just as there is no limitation to forced arbitration agreements in the language of the bill, there is no limitation to arbitration agreements entered into between little guys and big companies.

The very first appeal I ever took in a 30-year law practice in 1992 was in a case called *Bennish v. North Carolina Dance Theater*, in which I represented a fledgling, very-hard-pressed economically arts group in my hometown that had an employment dispute with a dancer who wanted to litigate. They had an arbitration agreement. It would have destroyed that organization financially to have to engage in extended and expensive litigation. This bill would have made the enforcement of that arbitration agreement unlawful, and it has nothing to do with big business.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 963, the FAIR Act, which prohibits the enforcement of forced arbitration clauses in consumer, employment, civil rights, and antitrust disputes.

Buried deep within the fine print of almost every contract consumers sign are clauses that deprive hardworking Americans and small businesses of their day in court when they attempt to hold corporations accountable for breaking the law.

We heard from lots of small businesses in support of this bill. No one claimed that they were required to have forced arbitration in order to remain successful. Forced arbitration protects systemic wrongdoing. Everyone is always allowed to have arbitration if they want to voluntarily once a dispute arises.

This forces people to give up their right to have their claims heard, and most Americans don't even know they have given up that right because they are forced to sign contracts, where in the fine print is a provision where you are waiving that right. When you get a phone, when you get cable, when you have internet service. This outrageous practice, as my colleague from Florida just described, is nothing short of a corporate takeover of our Nation's system of justice, and it affects almost every single American.

This private arbitration that is very expensive, that lasts a very long time also lacks the procedural safeguards of our justice system. It is not subject to oversight, it doesn't have a judge, doesn't have a jury, it is not bound by

laws even passed by Congress or the States in which it occurs, but it has become a requirement of everyday life for tens of millions of consumers and workers who have to surrender their rights to hold wrongdoers accountable.

These provisions require people to give up the right to have their claims heard in a court of law and to have that remedy that will prevent the wrongdoer from continuing.

Think about someone bringing a family member or loved one into a nursing home who doesn't have the opportunity to negotiate taking out that provision because someone they love is in desperate need of care.

I will give you a real example: Someone who is defending our country; the case of Lieutenant Commander Kevin Ziober, who testified in support of the FAIR Act in the last Congress. He served in the U.S. Navy Reserves since 2008. He was activated multiple times to serve in Afghanistan and Iraq.

On the last day of his employment, they had a party for him. They had a cake in the shape of a flag; they celebrated him; and moments later he was fired. When he said to his employer, "You can't fire me, there is a Federal statute that protects me," they said, "Sorry for you, you agreed to forced arbitration. You waived away your rights in your employment contract." And in the fine print, sure enough, there it was.

He testified at the hearing in 2019 that his case was in arbitration 7 years later. Nothing fast about that. And sadly, he said, "This happens every day across America, not only to service-members and veterans whose rights are violated, but also to working people and consumers of all backgrounds."

The FAIR Act will ensure that what happened to Lieutenant Ziober and what happens to millions of other hardworking Americans never happens again. Let's restore justice to our justice system by getting rid of these pernicious, horrible, unfair provisions.

As I conclude, I thank Congressman JOHNSON for his extraordinary leadership. He has been fighting to try to free the hardworking Americans and consumers and people who fight for our country from the bondage of forced arbitration clauses, and finally we can do that today. Vote "yes." Vote for the FAIR Act.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We still haven't heard an explanation for why this legislation deems it appropriate to eliminate arbitration for parties of all sizes. We keep hearing about the little guy versus the massive corporation.

Even in that circumstance, of course, what we may be talking about is like the case from 2011, *AT&T Mobility v. Concepcion*, where the issue was people in California had bought cell phones, they had been offered a free cell phone, but it wasn't made clear that they would have to pay the sales tax. So

there was a \$5 claim per purchaser, and wealthy plaintiffs' class-action lawyers wanted to bring a big lawsuit. With tens of thousands of them, they might get a \$5 coupon, but the lawyers would buy a new jet.

That may be in some circumstances, even the dispute with the big guy. But leave that aside. We still don't hear any explanation for why you are wiping out arbitration as a means that parties choose, even if they are on equal bargaining power.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Happy St. Patrick's Day, Madam Speaker. I just want to gently correct my colleague from North Carolina when he cited 8 percent inflation. On an annualized basis, we are seeing it being measured at 10 percent here. I can understand the Representative from Tennessee's sensitivity toward Bidenflation.

Today, we are here because the Democrats want to pass legislation that insults the intelligence of Americans. According to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the only people sophisticated enough to enter into arbitration agreements are unions, so they have exempted them from this bill. Convenient.

This legislation prohibits predispute arbitration agreements, which are a fair, efficient, and effective way for consumers, workers, and businesses to settle disputes without costly and time-consuming litigation that mainly benefits the trial bar. This bill will also deprive Americans of an effective legal option, while costing them more time and money.

Predispute arbitration agreements exist in many employment and consumer contracts today and are enforced like any other kind of contract. Arbitration is generally fair, often leads to better outcomes for workers, and does not keep claimants from simultaneously alerting the world to bad actors. Those agreements create a win-win situation for parties to contract in advance on a process for resolving future disputes.

Courts, accordingly, uphold and enforce lawful agreements to arbitrate when disputes arise between parties, an approach consistent with the fundamental principle that arbitration is a matter of contract. This policy of individuals being free to contract has arguably long been a feature of American law. Existing law also permits courts to invalidate agreements under generally applicable contract defenses, such as fraud or duress.

Some will argue that arbitration requires confidentiality. This is not true. The parties to the agreement always have a right to disclose details of the proceeding unless they have a separate confidentiality agreement. Nor does current law typically preclude a party from disclosing information obtained in the arbitration process or any resulting award. Arbitration is usually

less expensive and faster than litigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. It normally minimizes hostility, is less disruptive of ongoing and future business dealings, and is often more flexible. This legislation does not favor the American consumer. The only ones favored are the unions and the trial bar. This is not right for Americans, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this un-fair act.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Judiciary Committee and a sponsor of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for the time today to speak on the FAIR Act, and I ask my fellow colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill.

My colleagues and I on the other side of the aisle will disagree on much, but on one thing we can all agree, and that is the Constitution of the United States of America is a great document.

At the beginning of that document is the preamble, and the first 17 words of the preamble read as follows: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice," and then it goes on. But you can see at the very top, the ideal of the Founders was to establish justice in this country.

□ 1245

So they went about the Constitution by giving power to the legislative branch in Article I, to the executive branch in Article Number II, and to the judicial branch, the Court system, to establish justice in Article III.

And then, in the Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution where the Bill of Rights for we, the people, gave us our individual rights, with the exception of Amendment 10, which gives the States all powers not reserved to the Federal Government.

So the Bill of Rights, in the Seventh Amendment to the Constitution, it guarantees the right to a jury trial, a trial by a jury of one's peers for any civil case where the amount in controversy exceeds \$20 or more. That is still the law in this country. That is our Constitution.

But the Supreme Court has seen fit to erode our freedoms insofar as a right to a jury trial by allowing corporations, employers, to take away that right from people. That is forced arbitration.

Gretchen Carlson, with FOX News, when she came forward with her claims that she was fired because she resisted the demands of Roger Ailes to have sex with him, and she filed a civil rights action, she was met with the bar of a

forced arbitration clause in the employment agreement that she signed.

I was so happy, Madam Speaker, to attend a bill signing ceremony a couple of weeks ago at the White House where my colleague, CHERI BUSTOS' legislation, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act was signed into law.

We need to go further. We just heard, within the last couple of weeks, of former coach Brian Flores of the Miami Dolphins, who filed a lawsuit against the Miami Dolphins and a couple of other clubs, as well as the NFL, alleging that he had been discriminated against racially. He had been denied hiring opportunities and retention and compensation. He filed a complaint.

He is met by the NFL with an arbitration clause. If it is good enough for sexual assault and sexual harassment cases, constitutional rights, those rights, that same ability needs to enure to those who have been aggrieved by racial discrimination and other types of discrimination. And consumers need to be allowed to assert their Seventh Amendment right when it comes to a dispute with a shop owner or shopkeeper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. And so, what we have seen with the U.S. Supreme Court is they have allowed corporations to have rights under our Constitution. Nowhere in it is there a section for corporations.

Let's restore freedom to the people of this country as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights under the Constitution that we all live under. It is a constitutional right that, when there is a dispute, a party should be able to take that dispute to court and have a jury trial, and no forced contract should deprive that person of that constitutional right.

That is what the FAIR Act will do. It will render unenforceable, after the act is signed into law, unenforceable, any pre-dispute forced arbitration clauses in consumer agreements and in employment agreements, and also in civil rights cases, causes of action and also antitrust actions.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia suggests that this bill is about whether or not we are preserving the right to jury trial in the Constitution. But I submit, that is not really what is at stake.

The question is whether you resolve a dispute through arbitration or you go to the court system. If you go to the court system, there are innumerable paths within the court system that lead to not having your case decided by a jury.

In fact, only about 1 to 2 percent of cases end up proceeding to a determination by a jury. That means 99 or 98



out of 100 cases do not. They might be dismissed on a motion for summary judgment. They might be dismissed for failure to state a claim. There may be settlement processes that come to fruition during the course of the case.

But it is almost never true—think about that—that a case in court goes to a jury. So this notion that this bill, by eliminating the choice of arbitration, somehow preserves everybody's jury trial magically is a false choice.

And more to that point, the gentleman from Georgia, and also the chairman, in the inception, noted that we have just had a bill signing of a bill that excepts from enforceable arbitration agreements the category of sexual assault, sexual harassment. The majority of Republicans supported that.

The majority of Republicans will not support this bill because it represents the throwing out of the entire mechanism of arbitration, which has been, as I indicated, a feature of the legal landscape used with great utility and utilized throughout the last hundred years almost, since 1925.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ).

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, I move to recommit H.R. 936 and have my amendment that strikes the retroactivity provision of this bill included in the RECORD.

It is wrong, clearly not right, for Congress to step in and retroactively invalidate parts of millions of existing contracts. The parties to those contracts, in good faith, relied on those parts of their contracts when they struck their bargain. But if this bill becomes law, it will rewrite millions of existing contracts, which will lead to waves of new litigation.

This litigation will place new costs on businesses, consumers, and employees, who will be forced to pay more for lawyers, hundreds of dollars per hour and may get stuck for years in long court battles instead of having available the solution of arbitration.

Applying new laws retroactively undermines the rule of law and upends the certainty that parties are trying to create when they negotiate and enter into a contract.

My motion would make this bill apply only to agreements entered into after this bill goes into effect. I offered this amendment at the markup in the Judiciary Committee, but the Democrats there rejected it.

I offered this amendment to the Rules Committee, but the Democrats there chose not to make it in order.

I offer this amendment for a third time here on the floor of this House because this matter is critically important. Retroactively voiding millions upon millions of existing contracts is truly bad policy.

By making this bill apply only to future contracts, we can avoid the inherent unfairness of having Congress directly interfere in millions upon millions of existing agreements. I urge my

colleagues to support my motion to recommit.

Madam Speaker, if we adopt this motion to recommit, we will instruct the Committee on the Judiciary to consider again my amendment to H.R. 963 to ensure that the Democrats' attempt to eviscerate arbitration will not apply retroactively to the millions upon millions of contractual agreements already in place.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to point out that this bill does not ban arbitration. If two parties have a dispute and prefer arbitration to going to court, they can have arbitration. This bill bans forced arbitration, meaning arbitration that is entered into contracts that people have no ability to change. That is why it says pre-dispute arbitration agreements are struck by this bill, not post-dispute arbitration agreements.

So this bill does not eliminate arbitration agreements if they want to. It does eliminate forced arbitration agreements that the party, usually the employee or the consumer had no knowledge of probably and no ability to say no to. We used to call them contracts of adhesion, but we don't do that anymore.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my friends and colleagues, Chairman JOHNSON and Chairman NADLER, for this long overdue legislation that we voted on last year; and, as well, to acknowledge the forced arbitration legislation that was signed by the White House dealing with sexual assault.

Now we have come full circle, so let me try to reinforce, because our friends on the other side of the aisle—and I call them friends—not only have it wrong, they have it upside down. It is completely misconstrued as to what this legislation does.

And if you go out on the street corner and talk to any American they will say, of course I want the FAIR Act, because forced arbitration says to them that, in essence, you are obligated, you are indentured to the contract that you signed to get a job, to buy a phone, to get that big TV, and that you are not able to pursue your due process rights.

Now, this is a constitutional issue. The Fifth Amendment completely indicates that you cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, however you choose your due process of law.

We go on to the 14th Amendment; of course, part of the historic 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, and it indicates that no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States under this Constitution, which includes the right to a trial by jury, nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process again; and that you would guarantee equal process and justice under the law.

So let me factually say, though the signing of any contract or document is voluntary, often large corporations make it impossible to use their product or be employed without agreeing to a contract with a forced arbitration, making signing of the contract or document anything but voluntary; and clearly, it has constitutional implications.

Something that should alarm all American consumers is that according to a study commissioned by University of California Davis Law Review, 81 companies in the Fortune 100, including subsidiaries or relating affiliates, have used arbitration agreements in connection with consumer transaction.

Now let me be very clear. When you have a dispute, we are perfectly happy for you, as the individual, part of the contract, to say to the corporation, I don't care about my rights. I am going to throw myself on the mercy of arbitration. And in doing so, you may subject yourself to a limited decision, as Brian Flores was finding out.

Madam Speaker, let me tell you that American economic supremacy does not stem from the contributions of modern-day oligarchs, billionaires, CEOs, or the wealthy. It comes from the middle class. It comes from those 60 million workers and countless others who put in an honest 8-hour day, five times a week, in the simple pursuit of trying to feed their families and take care of their communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his generosity.

I oppose the upcoming amendment that talks about not excluding unions. Unions have agreements between individuals. Unions have the power, through their persons they represent, to vote yea or nay for that contract. So if they vote yea or nay on that contract, their eyes open on the arbitration, it is the union that will be protecting that individual. They will not be in that process alone.

In the instance of an individual and the contracts that are signed, they will be alone. But they will not be alone if the FAIR Act is passed and the Constitution is upheld. That is why I support enthusiastically the FAIR Act and oppose the amendment to be forthcoming.



Pass the FAIR Act because justice and the Constitution requires it.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 963, "The FAIR Act" which prohibits a predispute arbitration agreement from being valid or enforceable in an employment, consumer, antitrust, or civil rights dispute.

Action on this legislation is long overdue considering the long history of the problems caused by forced arbitration. The FAIR Act was passed by the House in the 116th Congress, so I hope we can pass it again now and that the Senate will do the same this time so we can finally resolve this problem.

Forced arbitration is typically due to a clause in a contract that takes away employees' and consumers' rights to pursue litigation in the case their legal rights are violated. 60 million American employees and myriad consumers are unfairly, and usually unknowingly, subjected to its limitation of their legal rights.

Though the signing of any contract or document is voluntary, often large corporations make it impossible to use their product or be employed without agreeing to a contract with a forced arbitration clause, making signing of the contract or document anything but voluntary.

Something that should alarm all American consumers is that, according to a study commissioned by the University of California Davis Law Review, 81 companies in the Fortune 100, including subsidiaries or related affiliates, have used arbitration agreements in connection with consumer transactions.

The study also found that possibly two-thirds of American households are covered by consumer based forced arbitration agreements.

This means nearly 86 million American households have their Constitutional right of access to the judicial system restricted.

For American employees, the numbers are also staggering. Similarly, 60 million American employees are subject to forced arbitration agreements of which they are often unaware until a dispute arises for which they seek judicial redress.

The extensive reach of arbitration clauses is only increasing, with the Economic Policy Institute estimating 80 percent of private sector nonunion workers being subject to forced arbitration clauses by 2024.

Madam Speaker, American economic supremacy does not stem from the contributions of modern-day oligarchs, billionaires, CEOs, or the wealthy; it comes from the middle class. It comes from those 60 million workers and countless others who put in an honest 8-hour day 5 times a week in the simple pursuit of trying to feed their families and take care of their communities.

The fact that so many of these hard-working Americans are having their legal rights taken away without them knowing it is morally reprehensible and must be put to an end. The FAIR Act remedies that 1 problem.

In addition to being sound policy, the FAIR Act promotes racial equity in our rapidly diversifying country and workforce.

Another study from the EPI found 59.1 percent of African American workers (7.5 million workers) are subject to mandatory arbitration, as are female workers (at 57.6 percent).

Unfortunately, this is not surprising considering African Americans and women are two of the most historically discriminated against groups in the United States.

Forced arbitration continues the struggles of African Americans in the workplace, from slavery, sharecropping, and redlining to ongoing segregation, discrimination, racism, and voter suppression. As these statistics show, our struggle for equity in the workplace continues.

We are exhausted, yet we remain in the fight. We must continue to set right historical wrongs, and the FAIR Act provides us an avenue to do so.

Fairness in the workplace for women is also further remediated by this legislation. In this country, we have a disgraceful wage gap between men and women of 82 cents to the dollar, according to the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics figures.

As a Member of the Women's Caucus, I have been fighting for pay equity for American women since before I arrived here as a Representative in 1995, and I believe that equal pay for equal work is a simple matter of justice.

Wage disparities are not simply a result of women's education levels or life choices. In fact, the pay gap between college educated men and women starts as soon as they enter the workplace and expands shortly thereafter. Women can have the same background, work in the same field, and perform the same functional position, yet still be grossly underpaid. Disproportionately subjecting women to forced arbitration is yet another stain on this country's historical attitude towards women in the workforce.

I have consistently been a proud sponsor and cosponsor of legislation that expands legal rights, creates a more level playing field, and erodes long standing social disparities.

The FAIR Act achieves these goals, and I therefore urge my colleagues to support the FAIR Act.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

On the other side of the aisle, we hear repeated references to defending the Constitution and the American way. I would remind the Chamber that our economy, the American economy, is built on contracts; which contracts, under the rule of law, are not forced, but enforced when someone refuses to abide by his or her agreement. That is not forced. That is where a contract is enforced.

We, our courts, our judicial system, and, yes, arbitration is the means by which we call people to live by their bargains, and that has been the key to the most successful economy in the history of the world. It has certainly been the state of affairs, as I said, for almost 100 years.

Throwing that out, dispensing with a major component of that on the premise that you are pursuing the American system is contrary to fact. It is, as Democrats often seek to do, it is transformational. It seeks to transform America, not to reinforce and persist it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK).

□ 1300

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. The

bill purports to assert a very important constitutional right, the right to trial by jury in civil actions. But it does so by denying everyone a very important other constitutional right, the freedom of two parties to agree to exchange goods and services according to their own best judgment.

Now, because of the excesses and expenses and uncertainties that have plagued our civil courts, many consumers and producers, and many employees and employers, find it advantageous to waive their right to civil jury trials in any disputes between them in favor of a simpler, cheaper, and faster arbitration.

Now, proponents tell us it is an uneven playing field, and this requirement is often imposed in nonnegotiable, take-it-or-leave-it propositions. This isn't exactly true. Every employee and every consumer, no matter how weak and vulnerable, has an absolute defense against a bad agreement. It is the word "no." No, the pay isn't good enough. No, the price is too high. No, I don't like the binding arbitration clause or any other terms, and I am taking my business elsewhere.

Now, even when there aren't good alternatives, the fact is that every provision in a contract is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition if one side or the other insists on it. The question for each side is whether the totality of the contract is beneficial to them or not. It is every grownup's right to make that decision for themselves without somebody in government making it for them.

Remember, the so-called forced arbitration provision forces the company to accept arbitration as well. For example, I am not a lawyer. I can't afford to hire one to take a big company to court. For me, binding arbitration helps level the playing field by providing me with an inexpensive alternative that the company must abide by. This bill takes that protection away from me.

According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, through arbitration, employees prevail three times more often, recover twice as much money, and resolve their claims more quickly than they could through litigation. And in most cases, the employer pays the entire cost of arbitration.

According to one study, in claims between \$10,000 and \$75,000, the consumer claimant was charged an average of \$219. Now, you compare that to the cost of hiring an attorney and taking on an entire corporate legal department.

The net result of this bill will be higher prices for products and lower wages for workers as companies factor the high cost of litigation into their business models.

Madam Speaker, that is not fair.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his remarks.

It causes me to remark, as the gentleman from Tennessee said a moment ago, that it is Democrats who look out for the interests of the little guy and look out for the interests of the people. I wonder why it is that looking out for the interests of the people invariably involves restricting their freedom in some way. What a remarkable notion.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act.

Forced arbitration deprives workers of the choice to have their day in court. When companies impose forced arbitration clauses, they choose every aspect of the process. They choose the mediator; they choose the location; and they choose the terms of the relief.

This is a lose-lose scenario, and it disproportionately harms workers, particularly women and communities of color, but it imposes enormous consequences for everyone.

You sign a contract for car repair, for car rental, for any consumer transaction, and when you need that car rental, hidden in those contracts is a prohibition from you taking any claim to court. No choice, no notion, even, for the majority of people that this fundamental right to that choice to sue an unscrupulous corporation is being taken away from you when you sign that contract.

Madam Speaker, I think of this bill as a bill for the little guy or the little woman. Women and people of color forced into arbitration face mostly White male arbitrators in environments that heavily favor corporate interests.

When musician Jay-Z entered arbitration without a single Black arbitrator in the room, he asked for “neutrals of color.” But only three suggested alternatives were Black, one of whom was a partner at the law firm representing the opposing party.

Eliminating forced arbitration would open the courthouse doors for women, for workers of color, for poor folks across this country, advancing social equity and aiding the fight against discrimination. But it is also the right thing for every single consumer to be able to pursue this right to a day in court.

Just last week, President Biden signed into law my bill with Representative CHERI BUSTOS to ban forced arbitration in cases of sexual harassment and sexual assault. That will protect the right of 60 million workers to a fair day in court. And that is just the people who are subject to employment contracts.

On top of that, it will apply, and it will apply retroactively, to all the con-

tracts around sexual assault and sexual harassment. That is huge progress.

What is good enough in cases of sexual assault and sexual harassment—and that bill passed in a bipartisan and bicameral way—is good enough for all workers.

It is time to take the next step by passing this bill to extend these protections to a fair day in court across the board.

Again, we emphasize that if somebody wants arbitration, it doesn't stop that route, but it does say you can't be forced only into this and into denying your day in court.

Now, let's also be clear that the FAIR Act is carefully crafted to protect unions. It preserves essential union bargaining power while creating freedoms for nonunionized workers. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have introduced an amendment that would undermine that power. This cannot happen. We cannot allow our Republican colleagues to undermine unions and the foundation of our middle class.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the FAIR Act, and I thank Congressman HANK JOHNSON for his leadership.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, one of the things that we have heard repeated a number of times, as the gentleman from Rhode Island suggested and the gentlewoman from Washington just said, is that if you go to arbitration, the company picks the arbitrators, and that is it. That is not, in fact, correct.

Courts police the fundamental fairness of the arbitration process. If there is a process that is fundamentally unfair, the courts will modify it until it is fair. So, that is a misconception.

Furthermore, it has also been suggested that it is by the whim of the arbitrator what the result is. That is exactly what Mr. CICILLINE, I believe, said. That also is erroneous.

If an arbitrator writes a decision that manifests a disregard of the governing law, like the soldier who had been in arbitration for 8 years that he suggested, the courts will vacate, strike down, that arbitration award.

It is important to know those premises before you decide what to do on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 963.

H.R. 963 undermines freedom of contract as well as consumer choice by banning informed, consenting adults from freely entering into contracts to arbitrate disputes.

Arbitration generally works well and is a fair and effective way to resolve disputes. While civil litigation can be long, complex, and costly, arbitration provides a cheaper and efficient process to resolve disputes in a timely manner.

Banning predispute arbitration agreements would mean Americans spend more time in court with no guarantee of better outcomes. Banning arbitration agreements during a time of significant inflation and in the middle of a supply chain crisis will effectively lower Americans' income.

While larger companies may be able to deal with the expense of a slew of new lawsuits, this change will cause harm to smaller businesses that may not survive lengthy and costly litigation battles.

Because postdispute arbitrations are rare, banning arbitration agreements will flood the court system. For one thing, some claims that are addressed through arbitration now may be individualized, making them unsuitable for class treatment.

Even where claims can't be combined, a plaintiff may still be worse off as a class member than he would be with the claim in arbitration. This is because the benefits of arbitration, particularly lower litigation costs, coincide with lower revenue for others, such as trial lawyers.

Banning certain predispute arbitration clauses and similar policy will benefit trial lawyers, not necessarily consumers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. WILD).

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise as someone who in my past life defended corporations and entities that often had mandatory arbitration clauses in their contracts. As such, I am uniquely qualified to address the myths that have been perpetuated about the FAIR Act. By the way, “myths” is a polite term for “lies.”

One has to consider that if we believe these claims that forced arbitration is cheaper, fairer, and faster, then surely workers and consumers would voluntarily choose it. So, there is no harm in restoring Americans' freedom to choose for themselves how to seek justice.

First myth: The FAIR Act eliminates arbitration entirely, and no one will choose arbitration if it is voluntary.

Fact: The FAIR Act doesn't eliminate arbitration, as has been said over and over here today. It just prohibits forced arbitration and allows both parties to choose arbitration voluntarily after a worker's rights or a consumer's rights have been violated.

If forced arbitration were instead voluntary, the private market would incentivize arbitration providers to treat both parties fairly and equally so that both parties would choose that process because they would feel like they are getting an equal opportunity at justice.

Second myth: Consumers and workers are more likely to win and get higher awards in forced arbitration than in court.

Fact: This is a lie. That is the result of a misleading study, which deliberately cherry-picked data by excluding all results for the most common way consumers and workers file their cases in State courts and through class actions.

The Chamber of Commerce only examined outcomes of individual cases filed in Federal court because it knows that very few consumer and worker cases are filed in Federal court. Americans are, in fact, more likely to be struck by lightning than they are to win a monetary award in a forced arbitration.

A study based on self-reported data from two of the leading private arbitration providers revealed that, on average, only approximately 382 consumers won a monetary award each year, less than the number of people struck by lightning every year in the United States. While an estimated 60 million workers are subject to forced arbitration clauses, only 82 prevailed in employment forced arbitration claims in 2020.

Third myth: Forced arbitration is faster and, as we have heard from some people across the aisle, cheaper than litigation.

Another completely false claim is based on faulty data from a forced arbitration database, which systematically deleted older cases, completely skewing the average length of a case in forced arbitration—simple data manipulation.

The idea that arbitration would provide consumers a cheaper way to litigate their claims, perhaps suggesting that they would do that without a lawyer, no major company will ever go to arbitration without their highly paid company lawyers. And every individual, whether they are in court or in arbitration, would need representation against a corporation regardless of the forum that they are in.

Fourth myth: The court system is overlooked, so forced arbitration provides more flexibility for scheduling.

While more powerful defendants have an incentive to drag out resolution of a case, that incentive exists whether they are in court or arbitration.

□ 1315

It is in the best interest of the individual who is filing the claim to seek the fastest possible resolution for his or her claim, and that would be done regardless of which they choose.

By the way, corporations often choose courts over arbitration to resolve disputes that they initiate, showing that they do so when it benefits them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Ms. WILD. Madam Speaker, myth number 5, the FAIR Act violates the freedom to contract. This is my favorite one. Whose freedom? That of cor-

porations or Americans? There was a comment that we are in the most successful economy in the history of the world, but for whom? Not necessarily for consumers or workers.

Don't Americans have the right to participate in the economy without being forced to forego the rights and protections that are afforded to them under the law? The United States Constitution's Seventh Amendment guarantees the right to trial by jury for every American.

What if corporations inserted provisions into their contracts forcing Americans to give up their First or Second Amendment rights to get or keep a job? Would we still be talking about the freedom to contract?

Finally, the last myth. The FAIR Act is retroactive. It is not retroactive. It only applies to cases filed on or after the date of enactment. We need a level playing field between corporations and industries and the people who find themselves aggrieved by them. The arbitration process—make no mistake about it—is a private process. People bringing their claims need to be able to fairly evaluate the best forum for that claim to be adjudicated.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong support of ending the use of forced arbitration and to restore the right of millions of Americans to their day in court. I think my colleagues have done a really good job on this side of the aisle in explaining why this is so important for basic rights of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell you a couple things that have happened in Illinois. I deal a lot with older Americans in my district—as I am sure many of you hear from senior citizens—and I have heard these really horrific stories from families who discover that in nursing homes that their loved ones have been neglected or abused or even worse.

These families want to do something about it. They want to hold these nursing homes accountable, and then they find out that they have quite inadvertently, quite unknowingly have signed a forced arbitration agreement.

Picture these moments. These are people who are often in very emotional situations. They are bringing their loved ones to a nursing home. This is never an easy situation. The last thing they are thinking about, among all the paperwork that is put before them, that they have signed away their rights. And then they find out that something has happened to their loved one in a nursing home and they are left without the recourse that they need.

We have too often seen corporations who are virtually immune from the kind of accountability that they should be held to. I think the time is up right

now. If it is good enough for sexual harassment and abuse, it is certainly good enough for people in nursing homes that have been abused and that their families have their day in court.

Madam Speaker, I support the FAIR Act.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I was intrigued by the situation we just had on the floor, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, I think she said she represented big corporations. Yet, she spoke to the fundamental unfairness of arbitration. It is ironic perhaps.

I spent almost 30 years—29 years in the practice of law as a litigator representing people in court and in arbitration equally. I represented plaintiffs and defendants both, frequently individuals, often businesses, always small to medium-sized businesses, and occasionally a local government or two, never a big company.

I have had clients who didn't want to have arbitration agreements enforced and sometimes I could defeat them or have them modified or change the results of them because the arbitrator had manifested disregard for the law. Sometimes I had clients who wanted to enforce those agreements. It depends on the circumstances.

But I can tell you it is not a tool that is uniformly bad. Although I have voted for accepting enforceable arbitration agreements, arbitration clauses involving sexual harassment and sexual assault cases, I don't believe that throwing the baby out with the bath water is a good idea. It is a terrible idea.

Let me let America in on the inside scoop. Here is what this is about. For the past, roughly, decade there have been a series of cases in the United States Supreme Court in which, through various efforts and methods, plaintiffs' class action lawyers, lawyers for big class litigation where they make millions and millions in fees, have tried various approaches to get the United States Supreme Court to allow class actions to be pursued through arbitration, and they have failed. That is why this bill is here.

The bill is to reverse the result of that decade of litigation in the Supreme Court in order for class action lawyers to be able to have a field day and to make a lot of money. This bill protects and seeks the fortune of plaintiffs' class action lawyers, and of course, it protects the patronage of big unions both at the same time. That is what the bill is about.

Madam Speaker, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, in today's economy, signing up for digital services often requires us to agree to lengthy terms and conditions that many users likely ignore and then

unknowingly sign away certain rights such as filing a lawsuit or joining a class action. The Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal (FAIR) Act addresses this rampant abuse of our legal system by banning mandatory pre-dispute arbitration clauses in employment, consumer, and civil rights cases.

These forced arbitration clauses are increasingly found in consumer contracts, requiring users to waive their right to sue in a court of law and instead resolve any disputes through arbitration. Because arbitration is secretive, lacks important due process protections, and produces decisions that cannot be appealed, it too often shields bad actors from accountability and prevents consumers from enforcing their rights in our justice system.

Many consumer contracts that include forced arbitration clauses empower companies to collect unseemly amounts of data from their users and abuse that data for profit. The problem is acute in highly concentrated industries where corporations wield significant market power because consumers often have little or no alternative to these anti-consumers contracts. This model of what's been labeled "surveillance capitalism" is bolstered by forced arbitration clauses that ensure the most egregious abuses of consumer data cannot be challenged in court. My legislation to protect consumer privacy, the Online Privacy Act, bars the use of forced arbitration clauses in user agreements about privacy for this reason.

No one should be required to sign away their right to access our justice system when they sign up for a credit card, cell phone plan, or social media account. The FAIR Act is critical legislation to protect the rights of consumers, particularly regarding online privacy. I'm proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FITZGERALD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 117-273.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, strike lines 16 through 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 979, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, instead of setting one standard and having everyone play by the same rules, the Democrats have singled out the unions for favorable treatment.

This legislation bans predispute arbitration for nonunion employees while preserving these benefits for union employees. This discrepancy makes no sense and, unfortunately, smacks of political favoritism.

Arbitration offers a faster and cheaper path to resolution of a dispute. Tak-

ing this path away from nonunion employees leaves these workers to the mercy of—like we said earlier—the high-priced trial lawyers, while union workers maintain the benefit of arbitration.

My amendment would remove this carve-out for union employees and restore parity between union and non-union workers.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle already shut down my amendment to limit attorneys' fees to a reasonable amount so that consumers are protected. I am disappointed by that. They also rejected my amendment to reduce the cost of this bill by exempting contracts for critical supplies that have been affected by the Biden administration's supply chain crisis.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to protect workers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would significantly weaken this legislation and damage the collective bargaining process for tens of millions of working Americans.

We have said it over and over again today—this bill is not designed to eliminate arbitration. While my Republican colleagues would like you to believe that the FAIR Act will end arbitration entirely, that is simply not true.

The FAIR Act would put an end to forced arbitration—arbitration that is not willingly agreed to by both sides, which is a predatory one-sided practice created by and for huge corporations to allow them to get away with abusive conduct. It is a system that can exist only when these companies can take advantage of a stark power imbalance between themselves and workers, consumers, and small businesses.

Labor unions correct that power imbalance. The collective bargaining process provides real protections that are unavailable to nonunion workers by forcing big businesses to compromise with skilled negotiators focused on improving terms for their workers.

Collective bargaining guarantees other important protections in the arbitration process, such as truly neutral arbitrators, better procedures, transparent decisionmaking, and the option to appeal decisions. It creates a system that can actually resolve disputes quickly, efficiently—and most important—fairly for all parties involved.

That is not forced arbitration precisely because it is truly voluntary. Arbitration only works when two parties of equal bargaining power can nego-

tiate terms that work for everyone involved, which is exactly what happens when a labor union and a corporation establish a collective bargaining agreement.

That is completely different than forced arbitration of nonunion employment disputes where an employee is forced to accept an arbitration clause that is buried deep inside the fine print of a stack of confusing paperwork on a take-it-or-leave-it basis that they must sign to get a job.

The big corporations love this system because it forces their workers, it forces employees, it forces the purchasers of products to go to forced arbitration, and that is an inherently skewed process. That is why the employee loses 98 percent of the forced arbitrations. The employer wins 98 percent of the forced arbitrations. That is not a fair process.

Moreover, as my colleague, Congressman PERLMUTTER, made clear during the Rules Committee meeting on this bill, nothing in the FAIR Act prevents individual workers from deciding to vindicate their rights before a jury.

As the plain language of the bill states, no collectively bargained arbitration provision "shall have the effect of waiving the right of a worker to seek judicial enforcement of a right arising under a provision of the Constitution of the United States, a State constitution, or a Federal or State statute, or public policy arising therefrom."

In other words, this amendment is a solution in search of a problem that could upend the rights of millions of workers today. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, to vote for the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I inform the gentleman from New York that we have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER).

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the FAIR Act. I have heard some of the debate in this Chamber today, and as a litigator, I disagree.

The FAIR Act is about restoring justice for the American people. It is for consumers, it is for workers, it is for small business people, it is for people whose civil rights have been violated, it is for millions of Americans who are denied their right to seek justice and accountability because of forced arbitration.

There is certainly a role for arbitration of disputes and other forms of alternative dispute resolution in our system of justice. I know this from my own experience representing individuals and organizations in the courts and before arbitrators.

The FAIR Act is important because it recognizes the role arbitration can play in resolving disputes between willing parties while it recognizes the fundamental rights of the people who have

been subjected to arbitration agreements without their true consent.

The FAIR Act protects the freedom to contract, the freedom of choice, and the freedom granted in our Constitution, including the Seventh Amendment.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

□ 1330

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, I would simply urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, there are over 60 million workers—a majority of non-union private-sector employees—who are subject to forced arbitration clauses. According to the Economic Policy Institute, that number will be over 80 million by 2024. Those employees are told that if they want to get a job or keep their current job they must sign away their right to their day in court and submit to a forced arbitration agreement. In most cases they do not have a choice.

When these workers seek to hold their employers to account for wage theft, civil rights abuses, or racial discrimination, they are shoved into a secretive arbitration process designed by corporations with almost unlimited resources, and they lose 98 percent of the time. That is what the FAIR Act will fix. This legislation will restore these workers' access to our justice system and guarantee their constitutional rights by ending forced arbitration.

This amendment would do nothing to protect workers while undermining this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this unnecessary and harmful amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 963 is postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

#### EXPRESSING THE HOPE FOR JUSTICE FOR THE VICTIMS OF BLOODY SUNDAY

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 888) expressing the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles, on its 50th anniversary as well as acknowledging the progress made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

##### H. RES. 888

Whereas on January 30, 1972, 26 unarmed civilians were shot by British soldiers during a protest that began peacefully in Derry, resulting in the death of 14 individuals in a massacre now known as Bloody Sunday;

Whereas as a result of the soldiers' unjustifiable use of force, the individuals known as John "Jackie" Duddy, Patrick "Paddy" Doherty, Bernard "Barney" McGuigan, Hugh Gilmour, Kevin McElhinney, Michael Kelly, John Young, William Nash, Michael McDaid, James Wray, Gerald Donaghy, Gerard McKinney, William McKinney, and John Johnston tragically lost their lives;

Whereas Bloody Sunday was one of the most significant and deadly injustices to take place during the Troubles, and exacerbated the conflict in Northern Ireland;

Whereas none of those shot by British Army soldiers posed a threat of causing death or serious injury, or were doing anything else that could justify their shooting;

Whereas the families of the victims of Bloody Sunday were denied for decades an honest and comprehensive assessment of the events that took place on Bloody Sunday;

Whereas in 1998, after campaigns from the families of those injured and killed on Bloody Sunday, a second inquiry was established by the Government of the United Kingdom;

Whereas this second Bloody Sunday Inquiry found that the shootings that took place on Bloody Sunday were the result of wrongful actions taken by British soldiers;

Whereas on June 15, 2010, then-Prime Minister David Cameron while addressing the House of Commons apologized on behalf of the Government of the United Kingdom saying that the events that took place on Bloody Sunday were "unjustified", "unjustifiable", and "wrong";

Whereas despite these findings and acknowledgment made by the Government of the United Kingdom, none of the individuals involved in the unlawful use of force that led to the murder of 14 innocent civilians on Bloody Sunday have been held accountable;

Whereas the lack of accountability and justice provided to those who perished from the unlawful use of force on Bloody Sunday both erodes trust and is dangerous;

Whereas accountability and justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, along with all victims of the Troubles, would represent a step towards addressing Northern Ireland's legacy of violence and promote reconciliation;

Whereas an environment which fosters accountability and justice for the events of the

Troubles must be established by the Government of the United Kingdom and maintained;

Whereas the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement with a devolved government in Northern Ireland as well as healthy "north-south" and "east-west" relations provides appropriate, useful, and productive avenues for discussion and negotiation to prevent violence, uphold peace, maintain stability, and promote the interests of all parties and communities involved;

Whereas the avoidance of a hard border on the island of Ireland is essential for maintaining the peace resulting from the Good Friday Agreement;

Whereas the full implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol as agreed upon as part of the United Kingdom's withdrawal from the European Union will assist in preserving peace and stability on the island of Ireland;

Whereas while progress has been made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades, it is in the interest of all parties to foster inter-community discussions and relations as well as integration in civil and societal structures to promote communication and mutual understanding; and

Whereas on January 30, 2022, peace activists, concerned individuals, and the descendants of those lost to this violence gathered in Derry to mourn, to stand in solidarity with victims' families in their search for justice, and re-commit themselves to the peace process established by the Good Friday Agreement: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the violence and killing of 14 individuals on Bloody Sunday 50 years ago and supports justice for the victims and their families;

(2) calls on all parties to take meaningful steps toward peace and reconciliation and to ensure justice for victims of the Bloody Sunday massacre as well as all those affected by the Troubles by supporting dialogue and negotiation between all parties;

(3) urges the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement to ensure peace and stability on the island of Ireland;

(4) recognizes the findings of the Bloody Sunday Inquiry, also known as the Saville Inquiry, and calls upon the Government of the United Kingdom to support prosecutions of individuals who committed unjustifiable crimes on Bloody Sunday based on the evidence collected;

(5) opposes any proposal by the Government of the United Kingdom to implement amnesty or statute of limitation laws that would end or inhibit investigations and prosecutions of crimes committed during the Troubles, including on Bloody Sunday;

(6) calls upon the involved parties to facilitate the implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol in the interest of maintaining peace and stability on the island of Ireland;

(7) urges the European Union, including the Republic of Ireland, and the United Kingdom to act in good faith with regard to negotiations around Brexit and implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol;

(8) calls on the people of Northern Ireland to foster further integration across communities and break down cultural, religious, and societal barriers that remain;

(9) supports the devolved government of Northern Ireland and recognizes the devolved government as a successful outcome and tenet of the Good Friday Agreement; and

(10) supports the continued strong governmental, societal, and cultural relationships between the peoples of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Republic of Ireland.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H. Res. 888, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my resolution expressing the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic days of the Troubles, a violent time which lasted 30 years from approximately 1968 to 1998.

This resolution acknowledges the progress made in fostering peace on the island of Ireland in recent decades and calls on all parties to come together to ensure full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement.

This resolution comes at an important time during the 50th-year anniversary of the massacre and on St. Patrick's Day, a day where people of Irish descent around the world remember our roots and celebrate our history. I am proud the resolution is moving forward on this day of all days.

First, I thank many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their sponsorship of this resolution. To the original cosponsors—Representatives RICHIE NEAL, MIKE KELLY, BRIAN FITZPATRICK, DAVID CICILLINE, JIM MCGOVERN, NICOLE MALLIOTAKIS, GERRY CONNOLLY, JUAN VARGAS, and TOM SUOZZI—and almost 40 other cosponsors, I am grateful for their support and for their longstanding work on this issue.

I also express my deepest gratitude to Chair MEEKS, Ranking Member MCCAUL, Leader HOYER, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee staff for their support of this resolution.

As a member and as a former chair of the Europe, Energy, the Environment and Cyber Subcommittee himself, Chair MEEKS understands firsthand the importance of peace and stability on the island of Ireland.

I introduced this resolution to honor the lives lost during Bloody Sunday, a singular day amidst a long period of struggle that exacerbated the conflict in Northern Ireland.

On January 30, 1972, I was a college student in Boston, a city known for its deep connection to Irish-American culture. I vividly recall the images and displays of unbridled violence during a peaceful protest in Derry that reverberated throughout the world. Even today, I remain deeply affected by the actions of British soldiers that led to

the wounding of 26 unarmed civilians and the death of 14 individuals.

On January 30, 2022, as 50 years had passed, I expressed to the families of the victims my firm belief that Bloody Sunday represents one of the deadliest injustices to take place during the Troubles. I underline that as we continue to mourn the loss of those who perished that day, we must also advocate for justice while taking the necessary steps to build a more peaceful future.

As I expressed to the families, accountability and justice for the events of Bloody Sunday must be achieved to ensure a long-lasting peace on the island of Ireland. While it has long been acknowledged that British soldiers were directly responsible for the murder of civilians on Bloody Sunday, those who suffered under this unlawful use of force continue to be denied an honest assessment of the events that took place in 1972. To date, not one of the individuals involved has been held accountable for their actions.

I want to state clearly: amnesty proposals by the government of the United Kingdom are disrespectful and deny due process to Bloody Sunday victims and their families. They run counter to the spirit of remarks of then-Prime Minister David Cameron who termed the events as unjustifiable and wrong. The evidence is clear: The individuals responsible for the violence that took place on that fateful day must be brought to justice.

Along with the avoidance of a hard border, these legacy issues remain as threats to and unfinished business of the Good Friday Agreement, an agreement few thought would ever occur. Both sides compromised. Its improbable success of diplomacy over violence inspires us today as Europe and the world face its greatest conflict in 80 years.

On St. Patrick's Day we take pride in the indispensable role the United States has played in forging the Good Friday Agreement. The Clinton Administration and congressional leaders worked tirelessly over two decades ago to implement the Good Friday Agreement and achieve peace through diplomacy. I admire the efforts of American leaders like Tip O'Neill; Ted Kennedy; George Mitchell; and my colleague, RICHIE NEAL, who were all instrumental in negotiating a long-lasting peace.

I firmly believe the agreement accompanied by the efforts of community activists and leaders willing to work for peace and commit to a political framework was and remains essential to creating stability in the region. We must continue to support the ongoing efforts to promote integration and reconciliation and address the impacts of intergenerational trauma.

Leaders like Monica McWilliams and Jane Morrice, as well as countless others working on these issues today, recognize that peace does not begin and end only on Good Friday. The work

they do and the work of others healed divided communities and should and must go on.

This resolution not only remembers those who lost their lives during the Troubles but also recognizes challenges and opportunities of maintaining the hard-fought peace that followed. Let Bloody Sunday serve as a reminder of the hard work and pain to achieve harmony.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MEUSER. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. KEATING, and wish him a happy Saint Patrick's Day as well as thank him for bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, happy St. Patrick's Day.

This January marked the 50th anniversary of Bloody Sunday when British troops in Derry, Northern Ireland, shot at a crowd of innocent protesters, killing 14 people. This unjustified act of violence marks a low point in the difficult history of Ireland in the 20th century. In fact, Bloody Sunday was just one of many tragic episodes during the Troubles which lasted 33 years and resulted in as many as 3,000 deaths.

This bipartisan resolution we are considering today commemorates this solemn anniversary. It also serves to remind the world that there is still work to be done to achieve full reconciliation and safeguard a lasting peace for all Irish people.

With the support of the United States, the 1998 Good Friday Agreement brought an end to the violence that characterized the Troubles and began a process to establish peace in Northern Ireland. Stories about atrocities, violence, and repression began to recede from the headlines. Today, Northern Ireland's story is one of prosperity, freedom, and peace.

Issues remain, however, and the United States and the U.S. Congress must continue to engage strongly in the pursuit of an enduring peaceful future for Northern Ireland.

The Good Friday Agreement signed in 1998 is the best framework to achieve this noble end. While post-Brexit arrangements for Northern Ireland have posed challenges to this historic agreement, both sides have worked in good faith to resolve them. This resolution also encourages both the European Union and Great Britain to continue acting in good faith negotiations to implement Brexit's Northern Ireland protocol.

I support our transatlantic allies' efforts to find a more workable solution for trade not only at the north-south Irish land border, but also at the Irish Sea border between Northern Ireland and Great Britain.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue the U.S. legacy of supporting a lasting peace in Northern



Ireland by joining me in supporting this resolution, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his support and for his bipartisan efforts at healing and moving forward.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), who is a friend of Ireland and a friend of mine. He is a champion of civil rights causes.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as well as my fellow Pennsylvanian, another great Commonwealth. You know which one I am partial toward.

Madam Speaker, I not only thank Chairman KEATING for his leadership in pushing this resolution but also thank him for the eloquent words that he just spoke. He laid out the situation quite clearly. I would like to just briefly elaborate.

□ 1345

Former British Prime Minister David Cameron, to his great credit, said these words about a decade ago: "There is no doubt, there is nothing equivocal, there are no ambiguities. What happened on Bloody Sunday was both unjustified and unjustifiable. It was wrong." He further went on to say: "I am deeply sorry on behalf of the British Government."

Now, despite those truly admirable words and despite the findings and acknowledgment made by successive British Governments, shamefully, none of the individuals involved in the murder of 14 innocent civilians on Bloody Sunday have ever been held accountable.

This resolution says: "The lack of accountability and justice provided to those who perished from the unlawful use of force on Bloody Sunday is both shameful and dangerous."

Madam Speaker, we remember those who perished. We also recognize the family members of those who were harmed and killed on Bloody Sunday who fought for decades and decades to finally get justice.

But we must go further than that. A few weeks ago, I led a bipartisan letter—and, again, this whole effort has been bipartisan, which is always the case when it comes to the issue of peace in Ireland here in the United States. I led a bipartisan letter to object to the British Government's latest plan to institute an amnesty, a blanket amnesty. I quote from this resolution, which is similar to the letter that we sent.

"We oppose any attempt by the British Government to implement amnesty or statute of limitation laws that would end or inhibit investigations and prosecutions of crimes committed during the Troubles, including on Bloody Sunday."

The resolution further goes on to talk about today and: "Calls upon the

involved parties to fully implement the Northern Ireland Protocol as agreed upon in the interest of maintaining peace and stability on the island of Ireland."

Madam Speaker, today, in the United States and around the world, as we celebrate St. Patrick's Day, all of us, whether like me of Irish descent or not, let us also make sure that we don't lose sight of this important civil rights issue.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a champion of the Good Friday Agreement, a person who I mentioned in my remarks was there at the time, working to make it successful. Ireland and the Good Friday Agreement have no greater leader and supporter.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, both friends of ours, for their words.

On this very important day, St. Patrick's Day, we are acknowledging a very important anniversary. Anybody who knows much about Irish history knows that anniversaries are very important. The acknowledgment of certain events that occurred throughout the sometimes perilous history of this small country of 6 million people, north and south, are reminded of just how grim Bloody Sunday was.

I knew those families. I recall when the former Prime Minister of the U.K., David Cameron, acknowledged years after in a public statement, in a speech that he made on the floor of the House of Commons, the then-Prime Minister acknowledged that Bloody Sunday had victimized innocent bystanders.

For a long time, the argument had been made that these were paramilitaries on both sides. It was only the test of history that fully acknowledged the truth of what happened on that day.

Their civil rights movement in the north was modeled, in some measure, upon the civil rights movement here in America. I knew John Hume very well. He was a great man at a great moment. I have known Gerry Adams and others who participated in these very difficult events. But out of this tumultuous time came something else, and that was the Good Friday Agreement.

We are now coming upon the 25th anniversary of that agreement. America is a guarantor of the Good Friday Agreement. Successive Presidents of the United States, Democrat and Republican, have all embraced the Good Friday Agreement as the way forward, the path, understanding as well that the success of the Good Friday Agreement came about because everybody had to give up something.

The Republic of Ireland gave up Articles 2 and 3 of its Constitution, which laid claim to the six counties of the north, and the United Kingdom gave up the border, which was a huge issue.

Strand 2 of the Good Friday Agreement reinforced the idea of a growing relationship between Dublin and Belfast.

Let me lay this out in perspective, in the time I have remaining.

Thirty years ago, in the north of Ireland, there were 30,000 British soldiers in an area geographically the size of the State of Connecticut. You couldn't go anywhere. It was a militarized zone. The Friends of Ireland, which is 40 years old—always Democrat and Republican, we made sure of it—the success of the Good Friday Agreement came about because of the goodwill of the men and women who live on that island.

We should be celebrating the outcome of the Good Friday Agreement. But part of it is also acknowledging these perilous moments in Irish history. I suspect that we will be discussing for years to come Americans' dimension to bringing about the Good Friday Agreement.

Just think of it: Two generations of children have now grown up in this small, six-county area not knowing anything about the violence.

It was the reach and the role of the United States, an honest broker, that helped bring about that agreement, which, even with bumps, people have fully acknowledged it has worked. So the template is there.

As we celebrate the ancient culture of St. Patrick's Day, there is something else for people of subjugation, occupation, An Gorta Mor, as the Great Famine is known, or civil wars, risings, and revolutions, that indomitable spirit on that tiny island, which we just celebrated, Republican and Democrat, with the President of the United States, last evening with the Taoiseach, the Prime Minister of Ireland, talking about the lasting bond between the two countries.

I hope that people will use the example of what the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have done today, because they have acknowledged this very important moment.

What happened on Bloody Sunday, the world had a chance to witness, and it helped shape world opinion. Thank you both for doing this today. There is not a better way to honor St. Patrick than what you two have laid out today.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a champion of civil rights here in this country, a civil rights movement in this country that helped inspire the Good Friday Agreement.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for his leadership.

How honored I am to be on the floor with RICHARD NEAL, who had a major and forceful engagement in bringing about the recognition of those who were murdered in 1972.

I thank my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle for joining in



this bipartisan effort, and I reenforce Chairman NEAL's comments about the bipartisan celebration of this great day and the great people of Ireland.

I am happy to be on the floor on St. Patrick's Day, and I wish all of my constituents, and friends across the nation of the great green, a happy St. Patrick's Day. But I come to make sure this day, Bloody Sunday, is certainly not forgotten.

I am so glad Chairman NEAL indicated its inspiration came from the toil and the soldiers on the battlefield, Madam Speaker, our beloved friend John Lewis, in the civil rights movement, and those who are willing to sacrifice for their belief and justice.

I am so glad that we ultimately found the truth to recognize John "Jackie" Duddy, Patrick "Paddy" Doherty, Bernard "Barney" McGuigan, Hugh Gilmour, Kevin McElhinney, MICHAEL KELLY, John Young, William Nash, Michael McDaid, James "Jim" Wray, Gerald Donaghy, Gerald McKinney, William "Willie" McKinney, and John Johnston, who tragically lost their lives.

As this resolution indicates, British soldiers came and shot them down. They did not understand their seeking of dignity and the rights that they had. So Bloody Sunday almost tracked some of the terrible issues that we had, but these people died and were injured, and many families for decades were denied truth.

I think it is very important that we stand on the floor today in a bipartisan way to honor that and to applaud Prime Minister David Cameron, who went to the House of Commons and apologized and said that the events that took place on Bloody Sunday were unjustified, unjustifiable, and wrong.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, how sad and maybe even criminal it was to ignore this for so many years. How grateful we would be when those who died for their rights, for justice, for equality, the very same tenets we all adhere to here in the United States.

Let me draw in now and conclude my remarks by joining in the resolution that urges the European Union, including the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom, to act in good faith with regard to negotiations around Brexit and the implementation of the Northern Ireland Protocol. But more importantly, let me emphasize the importance of the relationship between the United Kingdom, the United States, and Ireland. Let me track the fact that we believe in justice, we believe in civil rights, and we believe in the idea of the speech of empowerment and the speech of democracy.

Let us not resort to bloodiness and the killing of those who simply seek to speak for justice for them and their families.

Today, in commemoration of Bloody Sunday, never again.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 888, which expresses the hope for justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles, on its 50th anniversary, as well as acknowledging the progress made in fostering peace in Northern Ireland and on the island of Ireland in recent decades.

On January 30, 1972, 26 unarmed civilians were shot by British soldiers during a protest that began peacefully in Derry, resulting in the death of 14 individuals in a massacre now known as Bloody Sunday, or the Bogside Massacre.

Bloody Sunday is one of the most significant and deadly injustices to take place during the Troubles—also known as the Northern Ireland conflict—and describes the struggle between Irish Roman Catholics and British who sided with Irish Protestants that lasted from the 1960s until 1998.

None of the 26 unarmed people shot by British Army soldiers posed a threat of causing death or serious injury, or were doing anything that could justify their shooting.

The families of these victims were denied for decades an honest and comprehensive assessment of the events that took place on Bloody Sunday.

In 1998, after campaigns from the families of those injured and killed on Bloody Sunday, a second inquiry was established by the British Government, and it found without doubt that the shootings were the result of wrongful actions taken by British soldiers.

The lack of accountability and justice provided to those who perished and their families from this heinous use of force was unacceptable. They deserved justice.

Accountability and justice for the victims of Bloody Sunday would represent a step toward addressing Northern Ireland's legacy of violence and promoting reconciliation.

This conflict was rooted in suppression, silencing the voices of those who differ from you by taking away their freedoms and their liberties.

As an African American woman in the United States, I know too well the struggles of oppression.

The march led by our Beloved John Lewis from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama that resulted in the brutal beating of marchers by police is known as Bloody Sunday is a turning point in the civil rights struggle.

I stand with the victims of Bloody Sunday, because whenever oppression happens anywhere around the world, and people risk losing their freedoms and their liberty, I will always stand with them.

Mr. MEUSER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I do thank my colleagues for their articulate, eloquent, and important words: Chairman NEAL, my friend Representative BOYLE, Chairman KEATING, and Representative JACKSON Lee.

Madam Speaker, in closing, I again thank Chairman KEATING for his work on this bipartisan resolution to commemorate the anniversary of a tragic time in Northern Ireland.

It is fitting we are considering this resolution on St. Patrick's Day, a day

when many Americans proudly display their Irish heritage, including my own family. My mother, formerly Maeve McMenomy; her father, my grandfather, Philip McMenomy, who descended directly from Ireland. As a matter of fact, my mother's mother was from Ukraine.

As you can imagine, we know how to get our Irish up in our family and enjoy St. Patrick's Day and also reflect on the important history in Ireland as well as the very unwarranted and deadly and destructive events taking place in Ukraine currently.

Today, we can also say that we are at peace, perhaps proud. The scenes of violence from the past years in Ireland have subsided that have reigned for more than 20 years.

I was sorry to hear that the Irish Prime Minister tested positive for COVID yesterday, so we all wish him a speedy recovery.

I do look forward to the United States and Ireland continuing to build on our strong relationship and advance our shared interests.

This resolution is important right now, because we have had, Madam Speaker, far too many Bloody Sundays, including in the United States. March 7, 1965, was a terrible Bloody Sunday in Selma, Alabama. The last several Sundays in Ukraine have been as well, with unnecessary bloodshed without justification.

In the words of a good Irishman, Bono of the band U2: "No more."

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. It is critical that the U.S. Congress speaks with one voice toward promoting lasting peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative MEUSER, for his very eloquent remarks and his bipartisan support and leadership on this issue for Ireland.

I want to record and reflect upon the people lost during these tragic events marked by Bloody Sunday. They are John "Jack" Duddy, Patrick "Paddy" Doherty, Bernard "Barney" McGuigan, Hugh Gilmour, Kevin McElhinney, Michael Kelly, John Young, William Nash, Michael McDaid, James Wray, Gerald Donaghy, Gerard McKinney, William McKinney, and John Johnston.

We need to remember and memorialize these people, young and old, who stood peacefully, and in defiance, in their support for their values.

While many, rightfully so, have been commended for their work to bring peace to the island of Ireland, the victims of the Bloody Sunday massacre made the ultimate sacrifice, fighting against repression and demanding peace.

To the victims of Bloody Sunday; all victims of The Troubles, including the disappeared; the families of the victims; and the people of Ireland and Northern Ireland, I say this directly to you: We, in Congress, remember. We, in Congress, stand with you. We, in Congress, know there is much more work still to be done.

I introduced this resolution to demonstrate our solidarity with you, and I urge passage to signal that we will continue to fight for peace and stability on the island of Ireland.

With that spirit, I wish you all a happy St. Patrick's Day, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us by voting in the affirmative on this important resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KEATING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 888, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution condemning the killing of 14 individuals and violence on Bloody Sunday, one of the most tragic of days during the Troubles 50 years ago, and calling on all parties to take meaningful steps toward peace and reconciliation."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### SUSPENDING NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA AND BELARUS ACT

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7108) to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7108

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States is a founding member of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and is committed to ensuring that the WTO remains an effective forum for peaceful economic engagement.

(2) Ukraine is a sovereign nation-state that is entitled to enter into agreements with other sovereign states and to full respect of its territorial integrity.

(3) The United States will be unwavering in its support for a secure, democratic, and sovereign Ukraine, free to choose its own leaders and future.

(4) Ukraine acceded to the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization (WTO Agreement) and has been a WTO member since 2008.

(5) Ukraine's participation in the WTO Agreement creates both rights and obligations vis-à-vis other WTO members.

(6) The Russian Federation acceded to the WTO on August 22, 2012, becoming the 156th WTO member, and the Republic of Belarus has applied to accede to the WTO.

(7) From the date of its accession, the Russian Federation committed to apply fully all provisions of the WTO.

(8) The United States Congress authorized permanent normal trade relations for the Russian Federation through the Russia and Moldova Jackson-Vanik Repeal and Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-208).

(9) Ukraine communicated to the WTO General Council on March 2, 2022, urging that all WTO members take action against the Russian Federation and "consider further steps with the view to suspending the Russian Federation's participation in the WTO for its violation of the purpose and principles of this Organization".

(10) Vladimir Putin, a ruthless dictator, has led the Russian Federation into a war of aggression against Ukraine, which—

(A) denies Ukraine and its people their collective rights to independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity;

(B) constitutes an emergency in international relations, because it is a situation of armed conflict that threatens the peace and security of all countries, including the United States; and

(C) denies Ukraine its rightful ability to participate in international organizations, including the WTO.

(11) The Republic of Belarus, also led by a ruthless dictator, Aleksander Lukashenko, is providing important material support to the Russian Federation's aggression.

(12) The Russian Federation's exportation of goods in the energy sector is central to its ability to wage its war of aggression on Ukraine.

(13) The United States, along with its allies and partners, has responded to recent aggression by the Russian Federation in Ukraine by imposing sweeping financial sanctions and stringent export controls.

(14) The United States cannot allow the consequences of the Russian Federation's actions to go unaddressed, and must lead fellow countries, in all fora, including the WTO, to impose appropriate consequences for the Russian Federation's aggression.

#### SEC. 3. SUSPENSION OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS WITH THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS.

(a) NONDISCRIMINATORY TARIFF TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, beginning on the day after the date of the enactment of this Act, the rates of duty set forth in column 2 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States shall apply to all products of the Russian Federation and of the Republic of Belarus.

(b) AUTHORITY TO PROCLAIM INCREASED COLUMN 1 RATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may proclaim increases in the rates of duty applicable to products of the Russian Federation or the Republic of Belarus, above the rates set forth in column 2 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(2) PRIOR CONSULTATION.—The President shall, not later than 5 calendar days before issuing any proclamation under paragraph (1), consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate regarding the basis for and anticipated impact of the proposed increases to rates of duty described in paragraph (1).

(3) TERMINATION.—The authority to issue proclamations under this subsection shall terminate on January 1, 2024.

#### SEC. 4. RESUMPTION OF APPLICATION OF HTS COLUMN 1 RATES OF DUTY AND RESTORATION OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT FOR THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS.

(a) TEMPORARY APPLICATION OF HTS COLUMN 1 RATES OF DUTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including the application of column 2 rates of duty under section 3), the President is authorized to temporarily resume, for one or more periods not to exceed 1 year each, the application of the rates of duty set forth in column 1 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to the products of the Russian Federation, the Republic of Belarus, or both, if the President submits to Congress with respect to either or both such countries a certification under subsection (c) for each such period. Such action shall take effect beginning on the date that is 90 calendar days after the date of submission of such certification for such period, unless there is enacted into law during such 90-day period a joint resolution of disapproval.

(2) CONSULTATION AND REPORT.—The President shall, not later than 45 calendar days before submitting a certification under paragraph (1)—

(A) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) submit to both such committees a report that explains the basis for the determination of the President contained in such certification.

(b) RESTORATION OF NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to resume the application of the rates of duty set forth in column 1 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to the products of the Russian Federation, the Republic of Belarus, or both, if the President submits to Congress with respect to either or both such countries a certification under subsection (c). Such action shall take effect beginning on the date that is 90 calendar days after the date of submission of such certification, unless there is enacted into law during such 90-day period a joint resolution of disapproval.

(2) CONSULTATION AND REPORT.—The President shall, not later than 45 calendar days before submitting a certification under paragraph (1)—

(A) consult with the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) submit to both such committees a report that explains the basis for the determination of the President contained in such certification.

(3) PRODUCTS OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.—If the President submits pursuant to paragraph (1) a certification under subsection (c) with respect to the Russian Federation and a joint resolution of disapproval is not enacted during the 90-day period described in that paragraph, the President may grant permanent nondiscriminatory tariff treatment (normal trade relations) to the products of the Russian Federation.

(4) PRODUCTS OF THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS.—If the President submits pursuant to paragraph (1) a certification under subsection (c) with respect to the Republic of Belarus and a joint resolution of disapproval is not enacted during the 90-day period described in that paragraph, the President may, subject to the provisions of chapter 1 of

title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), grant nondiscriminatory tariff treatment (normal trade relations) to the products of the Republic of Belarus.

(c) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this subsection is a certification in writing that—

(1) specifies the action proposed to be taken pursuant to the certification and whether such action is pursuant to subsection (a)(1) or (b)(1) of this section; and

(2) contains a determination of the President that the Russian Federation or the Republic of Belarus (or both)—

(A) has reached an agreement relating to the respective withdrawal of Russian or Belarusian forces (or both, if applicable) and cessation of military hostilities that is accepted by the free and independent government of Ukraine;

(B) poses no immediate military threat of aggression to any North Atlantic Treaty Organization member; and

(C) recognizes the right of the people of Ukraine to independently and freely choose their own government.

(d) JOINT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL.—

(1) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “joint resolution of disapproval” means only a joint resolution—

(A) which does not have a preamble;

(B) the title of which is as follows: “Joint resolution disapproving the President’s certification under section 4(c) of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act.”; and

(C) the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: “That Congress disapproves the certification of the President under section 4(c) of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act, submitted to Congress on \_\_\_\_\_”, the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date.

(2) INTRODUCTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—During a period of 5 legislative days beginning on the date that a certification under subsection (c) is submitted to Congress, a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced in the House of Representatives by the majority leader or the minority leader.

(3) INTRODUCTION IN THE SENATE.—During a period of 5 days on which the Senate is in session beginning on the date that a certification under subsection (c) is submitted to Congress, a joint resolution of disapproval may be introduced in the Senate by the majority leader (or the majority leader’s designee) or the minority leader (or the minority leader’s designee).

(4) FLOOR CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If a committee of the House to which a joint resolution of disapproval has been referred has not reported such joint resolution within 10 legislative days after the date of referral, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration thereof.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—Beginning on the third legislative day after each committee to which a joint resolution of disapproval has been referred reports it to the House or has been discharged from further consideration thereof, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the joint resolution in the House. All points of order against the motion are waived. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed on a joint resolution with regard to the same certification. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. The motion shall not be debatable. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be considered as read. All points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the sponsor of the joint resolution (or a designee) and an opponent. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the joint resolution shall not be in order.

(5) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) COMMITTEE REFERRAL.—A joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate shall be referred to the Committee on Finance.

(B) REPORTING AND DISCHARGE.—If the Committee on Finance has not reported such joint resolution of disapproval within 10 days on which the Senate is in session after the date of referral of such joint resolution, that committee shall be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution and the joint resolution shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(C) MOTION TO PROCEED.—Notwithstanding Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, it is in order at any time after the Committee on Finance reports the joint resolution of disapproval to the Senate or has been discharged from its consideration (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) shall be waived. The motion to proceed is not debatable. The motion is not subject to a motion to postpone. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution of disapproval is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business until disposed of.

(D) DEBATE.—Debate on the joint resolution of disapproval, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between the majority and minority leaders or their designees. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution of disapproval is not in order.

(E) VOTE ON PASSAGE.—The vote on passage shall occur immediately following the conclusion of the debate on the joint resolution of disapproval and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate, if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

(F) RULES OF THE CHAIR ON PROCEDURE.—Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to the joint resolution of disapproval shall be decided without debate.

(G) CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGES.—Debate in the Senate of any veto message with respect to the joint resolution of disapproval, including all debatable motions and appeals in connection with such joint resolution, shall be limited to 10 hours, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(6) PROCEDURES IN THE SENATE.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the following procedures shall apply in the Senate to a joint resolution of disapproval to which this subsection applies:

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), a joint resolution of disapproval that has passed the House of Representatives shall, when received in the Senate, be referred to

the Committee on Finance for consideration in accordance with this subsection.

(B) If a joint resolution of disapproval to which this subsection applies was introduced in the Senate before receipt of a joint resolution of disapproval that has passed the House of Representatives, the joint resolution from the House of Representatives shall, when received in the Senate, be placed on the calendar. If this subparagraph applies, the procedures in the Senate with respect to a joint resolution of disapproval introduced in the Senate that contains the identical matter as the joint resolution of disapproval that passed the House of Representatives shall be the same as if no joint resolution of disapproval had been received from the House of Representatives, except that the vote on passage in the Senate shall be on the joint resolution of disapproval that passed the House of Representatives.

(7) RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE.—This subsection is enacted by Congress—

(A) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of legislation described in those sections, and supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such rules; and

(B) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

#### SEC. 5. COOPERATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY AT THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION.

The United States Trade Representative shall use the voice and influence of the United States at the WTO to—

(1) condemn the recent aggression in Ukraine;

(2) encourage other WTO members to suspend trade concessions to the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus;

(3) consider further steps with the view to suspend the Russian Federation’s participation in the WTO; and

(4) seek to halt the accession process of the Republic of Belarus at the WTO and cease accession-related work.

#### SEC. 6. MODIFICATIONS TO AND REAUTHORIZATION OF SANCTIONS UNDER THE GLOBAL MAGNITSKY HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 1262 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended by inserting after section 1262 (as amended by subsection (a)) the following new section:

##### “SEC. 1262A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

“It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish and regularize information sharing and sanctions-related decision-making with like-minded governments possessing human rights and anti-corruption sanctions programs similar in nature to those authorized under this subtitle.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2(b) and in title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) are each amended by inserting after

the items relating to section 1262 the following:

“Sec. 1262A. Sense of Congress.”.

(c) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 1263 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended to read as follows:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to any foreign person that the President determines, based on credible information—

“(1) is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in, serious human rights abuse;

“(2) is a current or former government official, or a person acting for or on behalf of such an official, who is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in—

“(A) corruption, including—

“(i) the misappropriation of state assets;

“(ii) the expropriation of private assets for personal gain;

“(iii) corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources; or

“(iv) bribery; or

“(B) the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption;

“(3) is or has been a leader or official of—

“(A) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, any of the activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) during the tenure of the leader or official; or

“(B) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section as a result of activities during the tenure of the leader or official;

“(4) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of—

“(A) an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) that is conducted by a foreign person;

“(B) a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

“(C) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) conducted by a foreign person; or

“(5) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or been purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section.”.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by striking “violations of human rights” and inserting “corruption and human rights abuses”.

(3) REQUESTS BY CONGRESS.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS” and inserting “SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE”;

(ii) by striking “described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in subsection (a) relating to serious human rights abuse”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “described in paragraph (3) or (4) of subsection (a)” and inserting “described in subsection (a) relating to corruption or the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption”; and

(ii) by striking “ranking member of—” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees.”.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 1264(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) a description of additional steps taken by the President through diplomacy, international engagement, and assistance to foreign or security sectors to address persistent underlying causes of serious human rights abuse and corruption in each country in which foreign persons with respect to which sanctions have been imposed under section 1263 are located; and

“(8) a description of additional steps taken by the President to ensure the pursuit of judicial accountability in appropriate jurisdictions with respect to those foreign persons subject to sanctions under section 1263 for serious human rights abuse and corruption.”.

(e) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1265 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2(b) and in title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114-328) are each amended by striking the items relating to section 1265.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, yesterday morning, Congress heard directly from Ukrainian President Zelenskyy. He showed us the absolute horrors that Russia is inflicting on the Ukrainian people in full view of the world, and he pleaded for us to do more.

With the legislation that stands before us at this hour, we intend to answer his call. Ranking Member BRADY and I have been united in our desire to end permanent normal trade relations with Russia. And I must say that Mr. BRADY has been very consistent as we have discussed this legislation.

With the House passage of H.R. 7108 today, we will take that impactful step and place even greater economic pressure on Putin and his brutal regime. We must do everything in our power to hold Russia accountable for the atrocities it is committing hourly in the nation of Ukraine.

This is an unprovoked horror that the world is seeing. Our partners and

allies are joining with us in this effort, taking similar steps to further isolate Putin and his regime from the rest of the civilized world.

I urge every single one of our colleagues today to support the Ukrainian people, punish Russia for its ruthless aggression, and vote to advance this measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, President Zelenskyy made a passionate plea to the United States and all free nations to stand with the brave people of Ukraine against Putin's deadly ambitions and heartbreaking genocide.

After showing gut-wrenching footage of Ukrainian cities torn apart by missiles and machine guns, he said to be the leader of the world means to be the leader of peace.

Today, Madam Speaker, we have the opportunity to lead, and I thank Chairman NEAL for his great leadership and work on this bipartisan provision.

After bipartisan public pressure from lawmakers in Congress in both parties, President Biden announced his support for suspending Russia's special trade status. We are taking that action with today's bill.

I was proud to have helped lead this bipartisan effort in the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. Both parties in Congress came together quickly, working in good faith on a bipartisan and bicameral agreement to immediately ban purchases of Russian energy and suspend our trading relationship with Russia and Belarus.

We don't take these steps lightly, but Russia's aggression requires this approach.

Russia will no longer enjoy the same special trade status with America as the country it is invading, so it will no longer be able to sell made-in-Russia products in the United States at lower tariffs.

Combined with the energy import ban Congress passed last week, which targets 60 percent of what Russia sells us, this provision targets the remaining 40 percent, hurting Russia's economy and cutting off funding for its war effort.

Said another way, American dollars will no longer fund Russia's war machine. This is another step in the right direction and includes further incentives for Russia to end its aggression.

This bill includes tough conditions to be met for restoring Russia's trade status, including Russian action to end hostilities, protecting the freedom and sovereignty of Ukraine, and ensuring the end of Russia's aggression.

The same tough conditions apply if the President seeks to end the energy import ban, and I plan to work with colleagues in the Senate to achieve that.

Going forward, we must continue to work closely with our allies to increase

pressure on Russia and ensure this is an effective global effort. Neighboring Canada has also taken serious action to do both of these, and other nations have announced their intentions to do the same.

Unfortunately, the administration's executive orders and the bill we are voting on today both fail to soften the impact of the oil ban by replacing Russian oil with made-in-America energy.

We have seen the highest year-over-year increase in wholesale prices ever recorded. Nearly half the price increases in goods come from the rise in the price of gasoline over the past year.

Nothing in this bill creates access to more American-made energy on- and offshore, nor does it approve American pipelines that could easily replace Russian oil with U.S. and Canadian energy, or accelerate approval for delayed permits for American export facilities to help the world wean themselves from the grip of dirty Russian energy.

There is still yet more Congress can do. I would like to see Congress sanction Russian energy companies so they can't continue to profit and fuel the war machine.

It is also time for Congress to unleash America's own ability to be energy independent, replace Russian oil with American sources, and use our energy strengths to wean the world from Russian energy.

Finally, I want to make it clear to my colleagues: This bipartisan and bicameral agreement applies only to the suspension of normal trade relations with Russia. I do not support the inclusion of the Democrats' Foreign Affairs Committee's Global Magnitsky Act in this bill, which includes changes to the original statute that I believe are unnecessarily vague and could lead to future abuses.

I understand this expanded language may have been included in a temporary executive order by the previous administration to address human rights, but I don't believe it is warranted in a permanent expansion of this law. I am confident there are Senators who share my concerns, and I strongly urge them to remove that provision for future vetting.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee who has been a real leader on this issue.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, it is great to see the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) come together with the ranking member.

Congressman DOGGETT and I introduced legislation 3 weeks ago. This completes what we had. I am sorry that we were unable to move forward, but I am pleased that the White House now feels comfortable moving forward with this legislation.

It is important that we are moving in concert with our allies, but I think we need that sense of urgency, based on

what we heard again yesterday from President Zelenskyy.

What we have done in Congress with the administration has damaged the Russian economy for decades, watching what has happened in terms of the collapse of the ruble, the cratering of their stock market, raising the cost of living for ordinary Russians, not just chasing the yachts of the oligarchs.

We have a quarter of the WTO that accounts for about 58 percent of the global domestic product. Moving to suspend this MFN standing means the Russian economy will face higher tariff rates, export bans, investment restrictions, export licensing requirements, customs hurdles, restrictions on cross-border services, and unequal treatment for intellectual property and rules of origin.

All of these further cripple the Russian economy. This is another tightening of that noose, sending a signal.

I hope there is more that we can do economically in terms of weapons, maybe even find a way to get MiGs to the Ukrainians without starting World War III.

But in the meantime, it is critical to move forward, to finish the job we started 3 weeks ago. I am pleased to support it.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from west Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, suspending Russia's normal trade relation status with the United States is the right and absolutely necessary thing to do.

I have to note, Madam Speaker, that our President continues to take an incremental and piecemeal response to Vladimir Putin and this unprovoked attack on Ukraine. It is wholly inadequate. Not only will it not deter this tyrant, I fear it will embolden other adversaries to follow suit.

Madam Speaker, we have to stop assaulting oil and gas. This has to be an early warning to the United States and lawmakers.

We can steward the environment. We should. But we have to understand the geopolitical importance of energy independence. We can do both. This is America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues, all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to support this suspension. But I urge my President: Be more resolute. Act with a sense of urgency. Provide the war machines and weaponry that the Ukrainians need to fight for their freedom and independence.

God bless America.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who has been a real leader on this issue as well.

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, the day after Russia invaded Ukraine, I introduced the centerpiece of today's legislation with Congressman BLUMENAUER. It denied Russia preferential

trade treatment and would expel it from the World Trade Organization.

At that time, 3 weeks ago, there was hope that economic sanctions like this might limit the extent of Putin's brutal aggression. Now we have seen that economic sanctions are having no immediate impact to limit the slaughter from Putin's war of annihilation against Ukraine.

Uniting the world to isolate Russia has weakened the ruble, certainly, but it has not stopped Putin from reducing so much of Ukraine to rubble.

While I favor excluding every possible Russian import, this bill will grant President Biden appropriate authority to raise tariffs significantly on any Russian import that is permitted, and the same for Belarus.

This is largely the same bill on which I sought action last week until President Biden requested a delay.

□ 1415

Surprisingly, this bill does not include the ban on Russian energy imports that this House approved overwhelmingly last week on the bill that we considered then. I hope that ban will be restored in further work on the legislation.

Though important to finally approve this bill as another way to isolate Russia, we should recognize there is no substitute for getting Ukrainians all of the weaponry that they have requested, including jet fighters, to stop the mass murder we observe daily.

The financial pain imposed won't immediately ease the pain of Ukrainian families. They are paying in blood while we pay in dollars, but it is one way for us to hold Putin accountable and to act in solidarity with them.

To those who ask that we adopt further sanctions or more weapons only if Russia does something more, I say what more barbaric butchery need we see before doing everything we possibly can, short of sending troops into Ukraine. The time to do everything is now, the time to provide for Ukrainian refugees to enter our country is now.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the Republican leader of the Trade Subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the long overdue legislation to hold Russia accountable for its invasion of Ukraine. It is unfortunate it took so long to get to this point, but I am glad we have finally reached a consensus.

This bill, as you know, revokes permanent normal trade relations for Russia and normal trade relations for Belarus, putting them in the same trade category as North Korea and Cuba, and appropriately so.

The U.S. must take the lead in showing the real economic consequences of violent acts against NATO members and partners, and this bill is a key element of that.

We were all moved by President Zelenskyy's address earlier this week,

and I am glad we are finally answering his call for additional assistance. We can and should do more, especially when it comes to banning energy imports from Russia.

As Republican leader of the Trade Subcommittee, I am glad this bill is finally seeing a vote on the House floor. I support this bill and certainly urge my colleagues to do the same so we can use the trade tools at our disposal to hold Vladimir Putin accountable.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who has had a longstanding interest in human rights.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, the Putin regime requires every strategy and every action that we can muster to put a stop to Russia and restore sanity to our world order.

Russia's aggressive and brutal behavior, brutal actions towards Ukraine is beyond what I call the pale. We have no other choice but to step in and put a stop to it.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this resolution.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 7108. Everyone here on the floor with me today can agree that Russia's aggression in Ukraine with Belarus in support is reprehensible and wrong.

While I strongly believe that this next round of sanctions will continue to hold Russia and Belarus accountable, we also can't ignore soaring fertilizer costs already propelled by global supply chain issues. Russia and Belarus, unfortunately, are major exporters of fertilizer and these sanctions may drive costs even higher.

But skyrocketing fertilizer costs won't affect my support for this bill. Peace must be achieved by all available measures. I will turn my focus now to solutions to drive fertilizer costs back down.

From temporarily or completely eliminating barriers for fertilizer trade from other nations, to input subsidies for our producers to offset input costs, we must be willing to put all available solutions on the table.

I have always argued that food security is national security, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to alleviate fertilizer costs to our farmers in order to grow food for our shelves.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a champion of human rights everywhere.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the world right now, not just Ukraine, but indeed the world, is engaged in a fight between democracy and autocracy. That is what is at stake on what is now the battlefields of Ukraine.

I was in Brussels 3 weeks ago at NATO, and I am proud to say I have

never seen the West and the transatlantic alliance this united. Certainly, not since the days of the Cold War.

Madam Speaker, our trade policy must work in sync with our foreign policy. That is what we are doing here today by revoking this status on Russia as well as Belarus. I strongly support it. I am proud of the fact that the United States and other countries have acted so quickly, in just a matter of a few weeks, to put the strongest sanctions on Russia in American history.

We must do this, and we must do even more.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ), the first Ukrainian-born Member of the United States Congress.

Mrs. SPARTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act. It is very important to highlight here that we are do include Belarus in this act. Unfortunately, under the leadership of President Lukashenko, Belarus allowed Russians to place ballistic rockets and shell fellow Slavs, orthodox Christians in Ukraine for weeks. The people of Belarus need to understand that their leader is part of what is happening in this genocide in Ukraine, and we cannot create a loophole where Putin is going to use Belarus to funnel moneys through them.

This is very important legislation also to send a message to Putin and his allies that the West is serious. It is not a temporary thing. They cannot just go kill a bunch of people, destroy cities, kill women and children, and then go back and have business as usual.

Congress is sending a very strong message. If they want to have peace, it better be soon, and they better get to the table and stop this insanity in killing of the Ukrainian people.

I also want to share some of the concerns that the Congressman shared regarding the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act. I concur with him that these definitions have to be tightened and to broaden these definitions is giving too much power to the executive branch. It is not what Congress should do because every time we give too much power, we are not able to effectively have our oversight function.

So I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation but also work with the Senate to make sure that we can fix our concerns. I am very appreciative that we are able to come on a bipartisan basis and send a very strong message.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), whose entire career has been consistently based on the advancement of human rights everywhere.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I congratulate him on his leadership. The connection between human rights

and economics is a connection that many of us have seen for a while. When it comes to some countries, for example China, when I was trying to get an adjustment in trade with China based on human rights, I was told, Oh, blah, blah, blah. But I said then and I say now of Russia, if we do not speak out for human rights because of commercial interests, we lose all moral authority to speak out for human rights in any small country in the world if these big countries are left off the hook.

Madam Speaker, as we convene today, war rages in Ukraine. Yesterday, the Congress had the great honor and privilege of receiving a virtual address by President Zelenskyy, whose heroic leadership has rallied his nation and inspired the world. Our Members were very moved by his powerful remarks as well as the heart-wrenching footage he shared showing the terror and brutality which Putin has unleashed in Ukraine, including committing war crimes against children.

So it is with great respect for President Zelenskyy's leadership and with unwavering support for the people of Ukraine that the House today takes another strong step to punish Russia for its war crimes.

It is my hope that this legislation receives strong bipartisan support, and I thank the chairman, Mr. NEAL, and the ranking member, Mr. BRADY, for working together to make that a reality because it is a recognition that is worthy of the valor and courage of the people of Ukraine.

The unimaginable courage, resilience, and determination of the Ukrainian people has been on full display, as they fight to not only protect their homeland but to defend democracy itself. The assault that Putin is making on Ukraine is an assault on democracy writ large. He is so cowardly and so insecure; he can't stand to see a democracy across the way from Russia for fear that the Russian people will see a better way instead of his autocracy. And so the Ukrainians are fighting for democracy writ large.

Yet, tragically, Putin has repeatedly responded by accelerating brutality, indiscriminately bombing major cities, attacking civilians attempting to evacuate the violence, and even murdering mothers and babies in a maternity hospital.

Russia's cruel and unprovoked invasion has already forced nearly 3 million Ukrainians to flee their homes, creating what the United Nations has called the fastest growing refugee crisis in Europe since World War II.

Because Putin shows no sign of ceasing his horrible aggression, the Congress today will take another step, in lockstep with the Biden administration and many of our allies, to tighten our stranglehold on the Russian economy.

The legislation the House will pass today represents an intense action to further isolate Russia and decimate its economy. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BRADY and Mr. NEAL for giving us this opportunity.



With this bill, the United States will suspend permanent normal trade relations with Russia, which means they will no longer enjoy preferential tariff treatment, take steps to review Russia's access to the World Trade Organization, and reauthorize and strengthen the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, so that we can impose even further individual sanctions.

In doing so, we will make it as difficult as possible for Russia to do business with the United States and our allies, and we will also suspend normal trade relations with Belarus for its shameful complicity in Russia's aggression.

Congress and the country salute Ways and Means Chairman RICHARD NEAL and Ranking Member KEVIN BRADY, who led the way to steer this legislation to the floor and garner strong bipartisan support for its passage. I would also like to thank Congressman LLOYD DOGGETT and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER for their relentless leadership in showing that the House was ready with this legislation so we could act quickly and decisively and have the improving touches that Mr. BRADY and Mr. NEAL added to it.

The legislation we pass today builds on swift, devastating sanctions already being imposed on Russia by America and our allies. We take this step with extraordinary unity not only within Congress on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, but also between the Congress and the administration.

□ 1430

And we do so with historic coordination with our neighbors abroad, as the members of the G7 and European Union have all agreed to revoke most-favored-nation status from Russia.

On behalf of the Congress, I salute President Biden for unifying our allies so that we could move together with this crushing blow. And we will continue working together to make Putin accountable for his despicable crimes as he violates the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine.

What Putin is doing in Ukraine, bombing civilians, targeting children, is outside, Madam Speaker, the circle of civilized human behavior. He is committing war crimes and he must be held accountable.

Madam Speaker, I urge a strong, bipartisan "aye" vote.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, the United States is the greatest market in the world to do business with. Our consumer spending is double that of the European Union, and more than triple that of China. Every country on Earth wants to do business with America.

As we deal with the unjust invasion of Ukraine by Russia and continue to modernize our Nation's trade deals, like we did with the USMCA, we must keep in mind that the American mar-

ketplace is not something that is a right. It is a privilege for those that uphold international order.

For far too long, many have overlooked repeated abuses by certain trading partners. For whatever reason, they decided it was okay for the United States to do business with those that lie, cheat, and steal in violation of international law.

This has been a terrible mistake. Trade, when done right, is a critical boost to the economy and our families. When done poorly, it enriches our adversaries at the expense of those who do uphold the international system.

It is clear that the unjust invasion of Ukraine by Russia cannot stand. Congress must make clear to the world that normal trade relations with the United States must be reserved for honest brokers that adhere to international order. This is the moment when irresponsible trade with the United States without consequence comes to an end.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), who has had a long history as a champion of human rights.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to put the full force of the American people and this Congress behind dismantling the savage Kremlin war machine.

This legislation shows President Zelenskyy, Ukrainians, and the world that America will boldly confront Russia's savage attacks on the Ukrainian people. This bill also holds Belarus to account for its complicity in Russia's murderous aggression.

They each will learn what every tyrant must: If you invade another nation, normal trade within our global economy is over.

While President Biden marshals the free world to fiscally cripple Putin and his oligarchs, this Congress will also move to crush Russia's militarized economic might.

So this legislation also reviews Russia's and Belarus' access to the World Trade Organization, and it extends and strengthens the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, both of which will further clip Russia's economic wings.

The grisly, heartbreaking images President Zelenskyy showed us yesterday made clear that Russia must be punished. And with this legislation, the people of Ukraine and every global democracy can count on America to help make that happen.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), the Republican leader of the Oversight Subcommittee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on February 8, President Biden said that if Russia invaded Ukraine, America would impose crippling sanctions.

On February 24, President Putin kept to his word and invaded Ukraine. President Biden has since then slow-walked the sanctions that he promised, those crippling sanctions that he promised.

Today, 3 weeks after the invasion, as we have watched on the news as Ukrainians have bravely fought, outmanned and outgunned, and yet they hold on tenaciously to their property at horrific costs. Their cities are being destroyed. Innocent civilians are being shot. Women and children are being attacked on the streets. And yet, the United States has been slow to move.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this long-overdue bill to suspend permanent normal trade relations with the Russian Federation and Belarus. I am a cosponsor of this legislation and would like to thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY for their hard work on this issue.

Last week, the House took the much-needed step of blocking oil and gas imports from Russia. When we debated that bill last week, I said we should have gone much further and should not have taken that watered-down approach.

The United States must stop projecting weakness to Putin and his allies. President Biden must live up to his word.

Today, we are finally taking a decisive step to punish Russia for their criminal aggression in Ukraine by ending their special treatment as a most-favored nation.

Can you imagine that we have continued to recognize them as a most-favored nation for three weeks, in light of the horrific war crimes that they are committing every day?

This is an action that only Congress can take, and we held off last week at the request of the administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, passing this bill will place significant tariffs on most of Russia's exports to the United States, further defending Putin's war machine.

The bill also gives proclamation authority to the USTR to further raise tariffs on Russia's goods so that American purchasers will stop funding Putin's war crimes.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) who has been a consistent champion of human rights.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL and Congressmen DOGGETT and BLUMENAUER for this important statement.

Slaughter is not a sufficient definition of what Putin and Putin's war is doing to the innocent Ukrainian people.

I rise in strong support of totally removing from them normal trade relations, as just a few weeks ago I was on



the border of Lithuania and Belarus, where the 30 to 40,000 Russian troops were poised, poised, ready to move and to slaughter.

How outrageous, when babies are killed, when hospitals with pregnant women, when a mother who lost her life because her pelvis was crushed, her baby and herself died because of Putin.

They continue to slaughter. They continue to destroy historic places. They continue to destroy hospitals and government buildings, and they are not ceasing.

So glory to Ukraine. We must stand with them and realize that their fight is our fight. As we in the civil rights movement experienced the idea of lack of justice, we know that this does not even equate to the violence that Russia is putting forth. I support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 7108, The Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act. The Act takes decisive action to respond to Russia's continued unprovoked attacks on the people of Ukraine and holds Belarus accountable for its support for Russia's aggression. This legislation counters Russia's unconscionable actions and Belarus' complicity by suspending normal trade relations with Russia and Belarus.

This legislation includes additional provisions to expand the United States' trade tools to stop Russia's unacceptable and unjust war on Ukraine and to hold Belarus accountable for its involvement. Specifically, the bill:

Provides the President with time-limited authority to increase tariffs on products of Russia and Belarus, until January 1, 2024;

Requires the U.S. Trade Representative to use the voice and influence of the United States to seek suspension of Russia's participation in the World Trade Organization (WTO) and to halt Belarus' WTO accession and accession-related work; and

Provides the President with the authority to restore normal trade relations with Russia and Belarus if these countries have ceased their acts of aggression against Ukraine and other certain conditions are met. Congress has the authority to overrule such decision through a congressional disapproval process.

Since Vladimir Putin began this war, the United States has had a relentless and devastating economic response in the form of sanctions.

Even prior to this legislation, the United States has already carried out the following actions:

The connection to the U.S. financial system for Russia's largest financial institution, Sberbank, including 25 subsidiaries, has been severed by imposing correspondent and payable-through account sanctions. This action restricts Sberbank's access to transactions made in the dollar. Sberbank is the largest bank in Russia, holds nearly one-third of the overall Russian banking sector's assets, is heavily connected to the global financial system, and is systemically critical to the Russian financial system.

Russia's second largest financial institution, VTB Bank (VTB), including 20 subsidiaries, have been appropriately subject to full blocking sanctions. This action freezes all of VTB's assets touching the U.S. financial system and

prohibits U.S. persons from dealing with them. VTB holds nearly one-fifth of the overall Russian banking sector's assets, is heavily exposed to the U.S. and western financial systems and is systemically critical to the Russian financial system.

Full blocking sanctions also extend to the three other major Russian financial institutions: Bank Otkritie, Sovcombank OJSC, and Novikombank- and 34 subsidiaries. These sanctions freeze any of these institutions' assets touching the U.S. financial system and prohibit U.S. persons from dealing with them. These financial institutions play a significant role in the Russian economy.

New debt and equity restrictions have been imposed on thirteen of the most critical major Russian enterprises and entities. This includes restrictions on all transactions in, provision of financing for, and other dealings in new debt of greater than 14 days maturity and new equity issued by thirteen Russian state-owned enterprises and entities: Sberbank, AlfaBank, Credit Bank of Moscow, Gazprombank, Russian Agricultural Bank, Gazprom, Gazprom Neft, Transneft, Rostelecom, RusHydro, Alrosa, Sovcomflot, and Russian Railways. These entities, including companies critical to the Russian economy with estimated assets of nearly \$1.4 trillion, are no longer able to raise money through the U.S. market—a key source of capital and revenue generation, which limits the Kremlin's ability to raise money for its activity.

There are additional full blocking sanctions on Russian elites and their family members: Sergei Ivanov (and his son, Sergei), Nikolai Patrushev (and his son, Andrei), Igor Sechin (and his son, Ivan), Andrei Puchkov, Yuriy Soloviev (and two real estate companies he owns), Galina Ulyutina, and Alexander Vedyakhin. This action includes individuals who have enriched themselves at the expense of the Russian state, and have elevated their family members into some of the highest positions of powers in the country. It also includes oligarchs who sit atop Russia's largest financial institutions and are responsible for providing the resources necessary to support Putin's invasion of Ukraine. This action follows up on yesterday's action targeting Russian elites and their family members and cuts them off from the U.S. financial system, freezes any assets they hold in the United States and blocks their travel to the United States.

Costs on Belarus for supporting a further invasion of Ukraine by sanctioning 24 Belarusian individuals and entities, including targeting Belarus' military and financial capabilities by sanctioning two significant Belarusian state-owned banks, nine defense firms, and seven regime-connected official and elites have been enacted.

Sweeping restrictions have been implemented on Russia's military to strike a blow to Putin's military and strategic ambitions. This includes measures against military end users, including the Russian Ministry of Defense. Exports of nearly all U.S. items and items produced in foreign countries using certain U.S.-origin software, technology, or equipment will be restricted to targeted military end users. These comprehensive restrictions apply to the Russian Ministry of Defense, including the Armed Forces of Russia, wherever located.

Russia-wide restrictions to choke off Russia's import of technological goods critical to a diversified economy and Putin's ability to

project power are also present. This includes Russia-wide denial of exports of sensitive technology, primarily targeting the Russian defense, aviation, and maritime sectors to cut off Russia's access to cutting-edge technology. In addition to sweeping restrictions on the Russian-defense sector, the United States government will impose Russia-wide restrictions on sensitive U.S. technologies produced in foreign countries using U.S.-origin software, technology, or equipment. This includes Russia-wide restrictions on semiconductors, telecommunications, encryption security, lasers, sensors, navigation, avionics and maritime technologies. These severe and sustained controls will cut off Russia's access to cutting edge technology.

Historical multilateral cooperation serves as a force multiplier in restricting more than \$50 billion in key inputs to Russia—impacting far more than that in Russia's production. As a result of this multilateral coordination, the United States has provided an exemption for other countries that adopt equally stringent measures. Countries that adopt substantially similar export restrictions are exempted from new U.S. licensing requirements for items produced in their countries. The European Union, Australia, Japan, Canada, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, have already communicated their plans for parallel actions. This unprecedented coordination significantly expands the scope of restrictions on Russia. Further engagement with Allies and partners will continue to maximize the impact on Russia's military capabilities.

Madam Speaker, taking further action against both Russia and Belarus on the international stage is of the utmost necessity in showing our European allies that we are steadfast in our opposition to this bloody war. The Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act does exactly that symbolically and literally, and I am confident it will play a role in ending this war.

It is for that reason, Madam Speaker, that I rise in strong support of the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act and urge my colleagues support for the Act.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN).

Mr. GROTHMAN. Suspending normal trade relations with Russia is important. It is my belief 20 years from now the part of this bill that will most be remembered is the change in the Magnitsky Act, which is normally used to sanction foreign elected officials.

Right now, the Magnitsky Act can be used only for defined crimes, extrajudicial killings, torture, prolonged detention without trial. We are now opening up that act to unlimited human rights, however defined, including sanctioning people, for example, not following the LGBTQ agenda, or not being sufficiently pro-abortion.

We have heard before this country weighing in on countries like the Dominican Republic, Hungary, African and Latin American countries, using our economic might to punish them when they don't adopt our view or I'd say the liberal view of Christianity.

It is with great disappointment that people held out and risked whether this

bill would go ahead or not on changing the Magnitsky Act.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) whose work on human rights is well known.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, as a member, co-chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I want to compliment Mr. CARDIN and Mr. WICKER and their work on this bill, bipartisan, from the Senate.

What Russia has done with Ukraine is immoral. It is illegal. It is against the word, the acts, the intentions of every godly character ever. God would not have approved. WWJD?

What Russia has done deserves the entire condemnation of the world; and everything we can do to condemn them and put them out of organized civilized society is appropriate because they are not acting as a civilized member of society.

I support this bill. I think there is not too much we can do to Russia. There is not too much that they have done to Ukraine and continue to do in killing children, and disabled, and orphans. They deserve all of the might of the United States that we can put on them and take away from them. We need to punish them with all we have. I support the bill entirely.

Glory to Ukraine.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished majority leader who, again, has been a consistent champion of human rights.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for yielding.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for joining in this effort to ensure that America speaks with a strong and certain voice.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, we heard from President Zelenskyy, an historic address that moved us all. He spoke in an hour of peril for democracy in his country and at a turning point for democracy around the world.

We were, and remain, awed by the courage mirrored by that individual who leads Ukraine, and of the people he leads who, in light of an overwhelming force, said no, we will not yield. We will stand, and we will fight, and we will speak out for our country.

Contrary to the premise of the war criminal who leads Russia saying that they would welcome the Russian troops with open arms. That was a lie, a lie to the Russian people, a lie to the Russian conscripts, and a lie to the world.

Vladimir Putin's criminal and unprovoked invasion of the sovereign nation of Ukraine has only grown more brutal, Madam Speaker, through the days and weeks. We have seen his forces target civilian areas, bomb hospitals, and disappear Ukrainian elected officials in areas they occupy.

This House is being asked today whether to repeal Russia's permanent, normal trade relations status. The question ought to be: Is Russia behaving like a normal, law-abiding nation? And of course, the resounding answer of the world has been no.

Indeed, there is nothing normal about its behavior or about Putin's choices. He has violated every norm that has been in place since the end of the Second World War. He is testing the resolve of the democratic free world. And thankfully, we are meeting that test with unity, with resolve, and with strength.

The revocation of Russia's normal trade status with the United States, as well as that of its ally, Belarus, is just the latest tool, Madam Speaker, being employed to isolate Russia economically and prevent the replenishment of its military assets being depleted in the invasion of Ukraine.

Putin clearly should have envisioned the pain that his invasion would be bringing down on his own country. That is a shame, because it is clear that a large segment of the Russian people do not want this war and, in fact, thousands of them are in jail because they have publicly made that clear.

They don't want to see their children being sent off to kill, maim, and terrorize the people of a friendly neighbor that caused them no threat; whose citizens maintain close people-to-people relations with the Russian people; and they do not want to lose access to the global marketplaces in which many Russian entrepreneurs and innovators have been participating and finding opportunities.

But no, the murderer of Moscow determined that he wanted to see the Russian empire restored, not because he was threatened, not because Russia was threatened, but because it would serve his ego and concept of empire.

□ 1445

As Russia continues to grow more and more isolated, as the vise tightens around its media, as the last few flickers of freedom for its people are extinguished, its people need only look to the Kremlin for answers.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." Vote "yes" for the heroic people of Ukraine. Vote "yes" for a leader that has shown us courage and commitment to freedom and to democracy. Vote "yes" to tell Vladimir Putin that norms still matter, and we will not stand by as he seeks to break them.

No, normal relations are not warranted.

Vote "yes." Vote for democracy. Vote for freedom. Vote for a courageous people. Vote for a free Ukraine.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as the Bible tells us, to whom much is given, much is required. Every American hearing and watching President Zelenskyy yester-

day had to understand so much more is required of us to end this war in Ukraine and to aid the Ukrainian people in their victory over Russia.

This bill takes an important step to defund American revenue that would fund the Russian war machine. It takes an important bipartisan step forward to make sure that Russian products don't enter into the U.S. with the same treatment as the invaded country, as Ukraine's products come into the United States.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to have worked with Chairman NEAL, our Democrat colleagues, and the House and Senate on this measure. I know more must be done to provide lethal aid to Ukraine to continue to expand and strengthen economic sanctions; to bring our allies together; to make sure, in my view, that America takes the necessary steps to replace Russian oil with the cleanest made-in-America energy, oil, and gas here in the United States as well.

But as Congresswoman VICTORIA SPARTZ, a Ukrainian-born Member of Congress, said, this step today is crucial in our defense of Ukraine, the Ukrainian people, and democracy in the world.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as I close, I thank Mr. BRADY for his partnership in this effort to hold Putin accountable and for his support for the Ukrainian people.

I also was moved by the gentlewoman from Indiana's testimony just a few minutes ago about Ukraine when she said this is not normal behavior. This is not the regularization, we hope, of normal behavior, a return to the old Soviet empire.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the terrific work of the Committee on Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee staff, particularly Alexandra Whittaker, Katie White, and Sofia Ferber. Their expertise and dedication made this legislation possible, and I thank them for their contributions.

Madam Speaker, I think in the many years that I have been in this House, one of the most moving moments occurred yesterday when we heard the President of Ukraine, Zelenskyy—duly elected, incidentally—talk about the pain and anguish but also the courage of the Ukrainian people. To witness the bombardment and the murder and killing of innocent children by this Russian dictator, I hope all the world, like this Congress today, will abhor that.

Madam Speaker, it is not enough just to applaud and to talk about the challenges that Russia has presented to the civilized world. We have to do something about it.

Coming on the heels of the oil embargo, I believe this will also receive broad bipartisan support today, and it will swiftly move from Congress to President Biden's desk. There is no time to waste.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7108, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 7108.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 8, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—424

Adams	Clark (MA)	Garcia (CA)
Aderholt	Clarke (NY)	Garcia (IL)
Aguilar	Cleaver	Garcia (TX)
Allen	Cline	Gibbs
Allred	Cloud	Gimenez
Amodel	Clyburn	Gohmert
Armstrong	Clyde	Golden
Arrington	Cohen	Gomez
Auchincloss	Cole	Gonzales, Tony
Axne	Comer	Gonzalez (OH)
Babin	Connolly	Gonzalez,
Bacon	Cooper	Vicente
Baird	Correa	Good (VA)
Balderson	Costa	Gooden (TX)
Banks	Courtney	Gosar
Barr	Craig	Gottheimer
Barragán	Crawford	Granger
Bass	Crenshaw	Graves (LA)
Beatty	Crist	Graves (MO)
Bentz	Crow	Green (TN)
Bera	Cuellar	Green, Al (TX)
Bergman	Curtis	Griffith
Beyer	Davidson	Grijalva
Bice (OK)	Davis, Danny K.	Guest
Bilirakis	Davis, Rodney	Guthrie
Bishop (GA)	Dean	Harder (CA)
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Harris
Blunt Rochester	DeGette	Harshbarger
Bonamici	DeLauro	Hartzler
Bost	DelBene	Hayes
Bourdeaux	Delgado	Hern
Bowman	Demings	Herrrell
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeSaulnier	Herrera Beutler
Brady	DesJarlais	Hice (GA)
Brooks	Deutch	Higgins (LA)
Brown (MD)	Diaz-Balart	Higgins (NY)
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Hill
Brownley	Doggett	Himes
Buchanan	Donalds	Hinson
Buck	Doyle, Michael F.	Hollingsworth
Bucshon	Duncan	Horsford
Budd	Dunn	Houlihan
Burchett	Ellzey	Hoyer
Burgess	Emmer	Hudson
Bush	Escobar	Huffman
Bustos	Eshoo	Huizenga
Butterfield	Espallat	Issa
Calvert	Estes	Jackson
Cammack	Evans	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	Fallon	Jacobs (CA)
Cárdenas	Feenstra	Jacobs (NY)
Carey	Ferguson	Jayapal
Carl	Fischbach	Jeffries
Carson	Fitzgerald	Johnson (GA)
Carter (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Johnson (LA)
Carter (LA)	Fleischmann	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Fletcher	Johnson (SD)
Cartwright	Fortenberry	Johnson (TX)
Case	Foster	Jones
Casten	Fox	Jordan
Castor (FL)	Frankel, Lois	Joyce (OH)
Castro (TX)	Franklin, C.	Joyce (PA)
Cawthorn	Scott	Kahele
Chabot	Fulcher	Kaptur
Cheney	Gallagher	Katko
Cherfilus-	Gallego	Keating
McCormick	Garamendi	Keller
Chu	Garbarino	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline		Kelly (MS)
		Kelly (PA)

Khanna	Mrvan	Sherrill
Kildee	Mullin	Simpson
Kilmer	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Kim (CA)	Murphy (NC)	Slotkin
Kim (NJ)	Nader	Smith (MO)
Kind	Napolitano	Smith (NE)
Kinzinger	Neal	Smith (NJ)
Kirkpatrick	Neguse	Smith (WA)
Krishnamoorthi	Nehls	Smucker
Kuster	Newhouse	Soto
Kustoff	Newman	Spanberger
LaHood	Norcross	Spartz
LaMalfa	Norman	Speier
Lamb	O'Halleran	Stansbury
Lamborn	Obornolte	Stanton
Langevin	Ocasio-Cortez	Staubert
Larsen (WA)	Omar	Steel
Larson (CT)	Owens	Stefanik
Latta	Palazzo	Steil
LaTurner	Pallone	Steube
Lawrence	Palmer	Stevens
Lawson (FL)	Panetta	Stewart
Lee (CA)	Pappas	Strickland
Lee (NV)	Pascarella	Suozzi
Leger Fernandez	Payne	Swalwell
Lesko	Pelosi	Takano
Letlow	Pence	Taylor
Levin (CA)	Perlmutter	Tenney
Levin (MI)	Perry	Thompson (CA)
Lieu	Peters	Thompson (MS)
Lofgren	Pfingler	Thompson (PA)
Long	Phillips	Tiffany
Loudermilk	Pingree	Timmons
Lowenthal	Pocan	Titus
Lucas	Porter	Tlaib
Luetkemeyer	Posey	Tonko
Luria	Pressley	Torres (CA)
Lynch	Price (NC)	Torres (NY)
Mace	Quigley	Trahan
Mallinowski	Raskin	Trone
Malliotakis	Reed	Turner
Maloney,	Reschenthaler	Underwood
Carolyn B.	Rice (NY)	Upton
Maloney, Sean	Rice (SC)	Valadao
Mann	Rodgers (WA)	Van Drew
Manning	Rogers (AL)	Van Dune
Mast	Rogers (KY)	Vargas
Matsui	Rose	Veasey
McBath	Rosendale	Vela
McCarthy	Ross	Velázquez
McCaul	Rouzer	Wagner
McClain	Roybal-Allard	Walberg
Grijalva	Ruiz	Walorski
McClintock	Ruppersberger	Waltz
McCollum	Rush	Wasserman
McEachin	Rutherford	Schultz
McGovern	Ryan	Waters
McHenry	Salazar	Watson Coleman
McKinley	Sánchez	Weber (TX)
McNerney	Sarbanes	Weber (FL)
Meeks	Scalise	Welch
Meijer	Scanlon	Wenstrup
Meng	Schakowsky	Westerman
Meuser	Schiff	Wexton
Mfume	Schneider	Wild
Miller (IL)	Schrader	Williams (GA)
Miller (WV)	Schrier	Williams (TX)
Miller-Meeks	Schweikert	Wilson (FL)
Moolenaar	Scott (VA)	Wilson (SC)
Mooney	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Moore (AL)	Scott, David	Womack
Moore (UT)	Sessions	Yarmuth
Moore (WI)	Sewell	Young
Morelle	Sherman	
Moulton		

NAYS—8

Biggs	Gaetz	Massie
Bishop (NC)	Greene (GA)	Roy
Boebert	Grothman	

NOT VOTING—1

Zeldin

□ 1529

Messrs. ROY and BISHOP of North Carolina changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano)	Garamendi	Neguse
Bowman (Garcia (IL))	(Correa)	(Perlmutter)
Brown (OH) (Aguilar)	Garbarino (Jacobs (NY))	Norman (Donalds)
Cárdenas (Gomez)	Golden	Pascarella (Pallone)
Carter (GA) (Cammack)	(Courtney)	Payne (Pallone)
Carter (TX) (Nehls)	Harder (CA)	Porter (Wexton)
Connolly (Wexton)	(Beyer)	Rodgers (WA) (Bilirakis)
Crenshaw	Horsford (Evans)	Roybal-Allard (Escobar)
(Fallon)	Jeffries (Kelly (IL))	Rush (Evans)
Crist	Johnson (TX) (Aguilar)	Ryan (Lawrence)
(Wasserman Schultz)	Kabele (Mrvan)	Salazar (Moore (UT))
Cuellar (Correa)	Kaptur (Lawrence)	Schrier (Aguilar)
Curtis (Moore (UT))	Kim (NJ) (Pallone)	Steel (Obornolte)
Dean (Scanlon)	Kinzinger (Meijer)	Suozi (Beyer)
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Taylor (Fallon)
(Courtney)	Lawson (FL) (Evans)	Titus (Cicilline)
DeSaulnier	Lesko (Miller (WV))	Trone (Beyer)
(Beyer)	Walorski (Bucshon)	Upton (Katko)
Fortenberry	Lofgren (Aguilar)	Wagner (McHenry)
(Moolenaar)	Maloney,	Walorski
Frankel, Lois	Carolyn B. (Wasserman Schultz)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Fulcher (Johnson (OH))		Welch (Pallone)
		Wilson (FL) (Cicilline)

#### MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF HONORABLE VICTOR FAZIO, JR.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I think that Members now know that yesterday we lost a wonderful, decent, extraordinary former Member of this body. Madam Speaker, as you know, he was from your State. His name was Vic Fazio. Some of you served with him. Most of you did not. He retired in 1998 from a very successful career.

Many of us in this House, who served with him and who remember him fondly, are grieving the loss of Vic Fazio. He was, until my dear friend BEN CARDIN came to the Congress, my best friend. They were two of my best friends. Vic and I were very, very close. Many others in the Congress of the United States would say the same thing, who served with him, that they were close to him.

Vic Fazio had an extraordinarily successful life. He was 79 years of age.

He was a leader and was a cardinal in the Appropriations Committee from his first year on the Appropriations Committee. He and an extraordinary Republican, who died just 8 months ago, who we remembered on this floor, another dear friend of mine, Jerry Lewis, also from California, co-chaired the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. They did so in a way that enhanced the sense of importance of this institution and of the collegiality that was possible in this institution. We said that when Jerry Lewis died. It is true when his partner now of that era has passed away.

It is an era that we ought to remember and hopefully replicate. Vic Fazio was a “Member’s Member.” He was an

institutionalist. He cared about each and every one of us, irrespective of the letter next to our name. He cared about process. He cared about substance. He cared about the integrity of Members. He cared about their well-being and how they were treated as Members.

In fact, it was Vic Fazio in 1989 who led the effort to reform the pay and benefits of Members. In that process, at that point in time, Members could make about \$25,000 to \$30,000 in what was called honoraria. It was a payment from private sector interests to Members for giving a speech.

Vic, and the colleagues with whom he worked, worked together to eliminate honoraria and to make sure, however, that Members could live decently in this town, an expensive town in which to live, with a salary that was appropriate. All of you who get your paychecks can thank Vic Fazio that they are substantially above what they otherwise would have been, but for his and other reformers' actions.

Vic Fazio lost his wife, Judy, and I lost my wife, Judy. Our wives knew one another. I lost mine 25 years ago, and he lost his some years ago. The sadness of his life is that he lost a daughter very early in life, and he never got over that. It was a deep, deep scar in his heart.

The good news is that after the death of Judy, he married a woman whose name is Kathy. I don't know whether Kathy is watching today, but if she is, we send her our love and our sympathy and our thanks for the life of Vic Fazio and the contribution he made to his country, to his State, to our Nation, and to this institution.

To give us an example of wisdom, of acceptance of others, of lifting others up, irrespective of that small letter next to their name, because he knew that all of us were Americans, chosen by our neighbors, which is the only way you can get here, to serve them, to represent their views in this body, and to make weighty decisions on their behalf that will have consequences for them and, as we do today, consequences for all the world.

For 20 years, Vic Fazio was the voice of Sacramento and Yolo County in the Congress. One of Vic's lasting legacies was the designation of 3,700 acres of protected wetlands in Yolo County. Perhaps, Madam Speaker, we can name that territory after Vic Fazio.

He was effective because he reached across the aisle and worked closely with Republicans and, as I mentioned, Jerry Lewis.

When the legislative appropriation bill came to the floor, we were all proud, because it was not a partisan bill. It was a bill for the institution and for the people.

So we remember a man of intellect, of integrity, and a warm and genial nature who was proud of his service, proud of the Congress, and proud of his colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I would ask all of us to rise for a moment of silence to re-

member a great, great American and great Member of this House, Vic Fazio.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the Honorable Victor Fazio, Jr.

#### FORCED ARBITRATION INJUSTICE REPEAL ACT OF 2022

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 963) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. FITZGERALD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BEATTY). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 1, printed in House Report 117-273, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. FITZGERALD).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 184, nays 246, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—184

Aderholt	Fallon	Johnson (SD)
Allen	Feenstra	Jordan
Amodei	Ferguson	Joyce (PA)
Armstrong	Fischbach	Keller
Arrington	Fitzgerald	Kelly (MS)
Babin	Fleischmann	Kelly (PA)
Baird	Portenberry	Kim (CA)
Balderson	Foxx	Kustoff
Banks	Franklin, C.	LaHood
Barr	Scott	LaMalfa
Bentz	Fulcher	Lamborn
Bice (OK)	Gaetz	Latta
Biggs	Gallagher	LaTurner
Bilirakis	Garcia (CA)	Lesko
Bishop (NC)	Gibbs	Letlow
Boebert	Gimenez	Long
Brady	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Brooks	Gonzales, Tony	Lucas
Buchanan	Good (VA)	Luetkemeyer
Buck	Gooden (TX)	Mace
Bucshon	Gosar	Mann
Budd	Granger	Massie
Burchett	Graves (LA)	Mast
Burgess	Graves (MO)	McCarthy
Calvert	Green (TN)	McCaul
Cammack	Greene (GA)	McClintock
Carl	Griffith	McHenry
Carter (GA)	Grothman	Meijer
Carter (TX)	Guest	Miller (IL)
Cawthorn	Guthrie	Miller (WV)
Chabot	Harris	Miller-Meeks
Cheney	Harshbarger	Moolenaar
Cline	Hartzler	Mooney
Cloud	Hern	Moore (AL)
Clyde	Herrrell	Moore (UT)
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Comer	Hice (GA)	Murphy (NC)
Crawford	Higgins (LA)	Nehls
Crenshaw	Hill	Newhouse
Curtis	Hinson	Norman
Davidson	Hollingsworth	Obernolte
DesJarlais	Hudson	Owens
Donalds	Huizenga	Palazzo
Duncan	Issa	Palmer
Dunn	Jackson	Pence
Ellzey	Jacobs (NY)	Perry
Estes	Johnson (LA)	Pfluger
Posey		
Reed		
Rice (SC)		
Rodgers (WA)		
Rogers (AL)		
Rogers (KY)		
Rose		
Rosendale		
Rouzer		
Roy		
Rutherford		
Scalise		
Schweikert		
Scott, Austin		
Sessions		
Simpson		
Smith (MO)		
Smith (NE)		
Smucker		
Spartz		
Steel		
Stefanik		
Steil		
Steube		
Stewart		
Taylor		
Tenney		
Thompson (PA)		
Tiffany		
Timmons		
Upton		
Van Duyne		
Wagner		
Walberg		
Walorski		
Waltz		
Weber (TX)		
Webster (FL)		
Wenstrup		
Westerman		
Williams (TX)		
Wilson (SC)		
Wittman		
Womack		
Adams	Garamendi	Napolitano
Aguilar	Garbarino	Neal
Allred	Garcia (IL)	Neguse
Auchincloss	Garcia (TX)	Newman
Axne	Golden	Norcross
Bacon	Gomez	O'Halleran
Barragán	Gonzalez (OH)	Ocasio-Cortez
Bass	Gonzalez,	Omar
Beatty	Vicente	Pallone
Bera	Gottheimer	Panetta
Bergman	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Beyer	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Payne
Blumenauer	Hayes	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Bonamici	Himes	Phillips
Bost	Horsford	Pingree
Bourdeaux	Houlahan	Pocan
Bowman	Hoyer	Porter
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Pressley
F.	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Jacobs (CA)	Quigley
Brown (OH)	Jayapal	Raskin
Brownley	Jeffries	Reschenthaler
Bush	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Bustos	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Butterfield	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Carbajal	Jones	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Joyce (OH)	Ruppersberger
Carey	Kahele	Rush
Carson	Kaptur	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Katko	Salazar
Cartwright	Keating	Sánchez
Case	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Casten	Khanna	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Schiff
Cherfilus-	Kim (NJ)	Schneider
McCormick	Kind	Schrier
Chu	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Ciциlline	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Lamb	Sewell
Cleaver	Langevin	Sherman
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Sires
Connolly	Lawrence	Slotkin
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Correa	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lee (NV)	Soto
Courtney	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Craig	Levin (CA)	Speier
Crist	Levin (MI)	Stansbury
Crow	Lieu	Stanton
Cuellar	Lofgren	Staubert
Davis, Danny K.	Lowenthal	Stevens
Davis, Rodney	Luria	Strickland
Dean	Lynch	Suozzi
DeFazio	Malinowski	Swalwell
DeGette	Malliotakis	Takano
Maloney,	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn B.	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean	Maloney, Sean	
Manning	Manning	
Matsui	Matsui	
McBath	McBath	
McClain	McClain	
McCollum	McCollum	
McEachin	McEachin	
McGovern	McGovern	
McKinley	McKinley	
McNerney	McNerney	
Meeks	Meeks	
Meng	Meng	
Meuser	Meuser	
Mfume	Mfume	
Moore (WI)	Moore (WI)	
Morelle	Morelle	
Moulton	Moulton	
Mrvan	Mrvan	
Murphy (FL)	Murphy (FL)	
Nadler	Nadler	

Wexton Williams (GA) Yarmuth  
Wild Wilson (FL) Young

## NOT VOTING—2

Kinzinger Zeldin  
□ 1559

Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, and Mr. MEUSER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano)	Garamendi	Pascarell
Bowman (Garcia (IL))	Garbarino	(Correa)
Brown (OH)	(Jacobs (NY))	Payne (Pallone)
(Aguilar)	Golden	Porter (Wexton)
Cárdenas	(Courtney)	Rodgers (WA)
(Gomez)	Harder (CA)	(Bilirakis)
Carter (GA)	(Beyer)	Roybal-Allard
(Cammack)	Horsford (Evans)	(Escobar)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (TX)	Rush (Evans)
(Nehls)	(Aguilar)	Salazar (Moore)
Connolly	Kahele (Mrvan)	(UT)
(Wexton)	Kaptur	Schrier (Aguilar)
Crenshaw	(Lawrence)	Sires (Pallone)
(Fallon)	Kim (NJ)	Steel (Oberholte)
Crist	(Pallone)	Suozi (Beyer)
(Wasserman)	Kirkpatrick	Taylor (Fallon)
Schultz	(Pallone)	Titus (Cicilline)
Cuellar (Correa)	Lawson (FL)	Trone (Beyer)
Curtis (Moore)	(Evans)	Upton (Katko)
(UT)	Lesko (Miller)	Wagner
Dean (Scanlon)	(WV)	(McHenry)
DeLauro	Lofgren	Walorski
(Courtney)	(Aguilar)	(Bucshon)
DeSaulnier	Maloney	Watson Coleman
(Beyer)	Carolyn B.	(Pallone)
Fortenberry	(Wasserman)	Welch (Pallone)
(Moolenaar)	Schultz	Wilson (FL)
Frankel, Lois	Neguse	(Cicilline)
(Wexton)	(Perlmutter)	
Fulcher (Johnson)	Norman	
(OH)	(Donalds)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

## MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bentz moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 963) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. BENTZ is as follows:

Page 7, beginning on line 22, strike “dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after such date” and insert “agreement made on or after such date”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 208, nays 222, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

## YEAS—208

Aderholt	Jimenez	Miller-Meeks
Allen	Gohmert	Moolenaar
Amodei	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Armstrong	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Good (VA)	Moore (UT)
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Bacon	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Baird	Granger	Nehls
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Banks	Graves (MO)	Norman
Barr	Green (TN)	Oberholte
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Owens
Bergman	Griffith	Palazzo
Bice (OK)	Grothman	Palmer
Biggs	Guest	Pence
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Pfleger
Boebert	Harshbarger	Posey
Bost	Hartzler	Reed
Brady	Hern	Reschenthaler
Brooks	Herrrell	Rice (SC)
Buchanan	Herrera Beutler	Rodgers (WA)
Buck	Hice (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Budd	Hill	Rose
Burchett	Hinson	Rosendale
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Calvert	Hudson	Roy
Cammack	Huizenga	Rutherford
Carey	Issa	Salazar
Carl	Jackson	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Jacobs (NY)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Cawthorn	Johnson (OH)	Sessions
Chabot	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Cheney	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Cline	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Clyde	Katko	Smucker
Cole	Keller	Spartz
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Steel
Crenshaw	Kim (CA)	Stefanik
Curtis	Kustoff	Steil
Davidson	LaHood	Steube
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Stewart
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Latta	Tenney
Donalds	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lesko	Tiffany
Dunn	Letlow	Timmons
Ellzey	Long	Turner
Emmer	Loudermilk	Upton
Estes	Lucas	Valadao
Fallon	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Feenstra	Mace	Van Dune
Ferguson	Malliotakis	Wagner
Fischbach	Mann	Walberg
Fitzgerald	Massie	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	Mast	Waltz
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Weber (TX)
Fortenberry	McCaul	Webster (FL)
Fox	McClain	Wenstrup
Franklin, C.	McClintock	Westerman
Scott	McHenry	Williams (TX)
Fulcher	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Gallagher	Meijer	Wittman
Garbarino	Meuser	Womack
Garcia (CA)	Miller (IL)	Young
Gibbs	Miller (WV)	

## NAYS—222

Adams	Brownley	Clyburn
Aguilar	Bush	Cohen
Allred	Bustos	Connolly
Auchincloss	Butterfield	Cooper
Axne	Carbajal	Correa
Barragán	Cárdenas	Costa
Bass	Carson	Courtney
Beatty	Carter (LA)	Craig
Bera	Cartwright	Crist
Beyer	Case	Crow
Bishop (GA)	Casten	Cuellar
Blumenauer	Castor (FL)	Davids (KS)
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny K.
Bonamici	Cherfilus-	Dean
Bourdeaux	McCormick	DeFazio
Bowman	Chu	DeGette
Boyle, Brendan	Cicilline	DeLauro
F.	Clark (MA)	DeBene
Brown (MD)	Clarke (NY)	Delgado
Brown (OH)	Cleaver	Demings

DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ross
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Ruiz
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Ruppersberger
Doyle, Michael	Leger Fernandez	Rush
F.	Levin (CA)	Ryan
Escobar	Levin (MI)	Sánchez
Eshoo	Lieu	Sarbanes
Espallat	Lofgren	Scanlon
Evans	Lowenthal	Schakowsky
Fletcher	Luria	Schiff
Foster	Lynch	Schneider
Frankel, Lois	Malinowski	Schrader
Gaetz	Maloney	Schrier
Gallego	Carolyn B.	Scott (VA)
Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Scott, David
Garcia (IL)	Manning	Sewell
Garcia (TX)	Matsui	Sherman
Golden	McBath	Sherrill
Gomez	McCollum	Sires
Gonzalez,	McEachin	Slotkin
Vicente	McGovern	Smith (WA)
Gottheimer	McNerney	Soto
Green, Al (TX)	Meeks	Spanberger
Grijalva	Meng	Speier
Harder (CA)	Mfume	Stansbury
Hayes	Moore (WI)	Stanton
Higgins (NY)	Morelle	Stevens
Himes	Moulton	Strickland
Horsford	Mrvan	Suozi
Houlahan	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell
Hoyer	Nadler	Takano
Huffman	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
Jackson Lee	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Jacobs (CA)	Neguse	Titus
Jayapal	Newman	Tlaib
Jeffries	Norcross	Tonko
Johnson (GA)	O'Halleran	Torres (CA)
Johnson (TX)	Ocasio-Cortez	Torres (NY)
Jones	Omar	Trahan
Kahele	Pallone	Trone
Kaptur	Panetta	Underwood
Keating	Pappas	Vargas
Kelly (IL)	Pascarell	Veasey
Khanna	Payne	Vela
Kildee	Perlmutter	Velázquez
Kilmer	Peters	Wasserman
Kim (NJ)	Phillips	Schultz
Kind	Pingree	Waters
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Watson Coleman
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Welch
Kuster	Pressley	Wexton
Lamb	Price (NC)	Wild
Langevin	Quigley	Williams (GA)
Larsen (WA)	Raskin	Wilson (FL)
Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—2

Kinzinger Zeldin

## □ 1619

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano)	Frankel, Lois	Maloney,
Bowman (Garcia (IL))	(Wexton)	Carolyn B.
Brown (OH)	Fulcher (Johnson)	(Wasserman)
(Aguilar)	(OH)	Schultz
Cárdenas	Garamendi	Neguse
(Gomez)	(Correa)	(Perlmutter)
Carter (GA)	Garbarino	Norman
(Cammack)	(Jacobs (NY))	(Donalds)
Carter (TX)	Golden	Pascarell
(Nehls)	(Courtney)	(Pallone)
Connolly	Harder (CA)	Payne (Pallone)
(Wexton)	(Beyer)	Porter (Wexton)
Crenshaw	Horsford (Evans)	Rodgers (WA)
(Fallon)	Johnson (TX)	(Bilirakis)
Crist	(Aguilar)	Roybal-Allard
(Wasserman)	Kahele (Mrvan)	(Escobar)
Schultz	Kaptur	Rush (Evans)
Cuellar (Correa)	(Lawrence)	Salazar (Moore)
Curtis (Moore)	Kim (NJ)	(UT)
(UT)	(Pallone)	Schrier (Aguilar)
Dean (Scanlon)	Kirkpatrick	Sires (Pallone)
DeLauro	(Pallone)	Steel (Oberholte)
(Courtney)	Lawson (FL)	Suozi (Beyer)
DeSaulnier	(Evans)	Taylor (Fallon)
(Beyer)	Lesko (Miller)	Titus (Cicilline)
Fortenberry	(WV)	Trone (Beyer)
(Moolenaar)	Lofgren	Upton (Katko)
	(Aguilar)	Wagner
		(McHenry)

Walorski (Bucshon) Watson Coleman (Pallone) Wilson (FL) (Cicilline) Welch Wexton

Wild Williams (GA) Wilson (FL) Yarmuth

## NAYS—209

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MALINOWSKI). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 209, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—222

Adams Gallego Napolitano  
Aguilar Garamendi Neal  
Allred Garcia (IL) Neguse  
Auchincloss Garcia (TX) Newman  
Axne Golden Norcross  
Barragán Gomez O'Halleran  
Bass Gonzalez, Casio-Cortez  
Beatty Vicente Omar  
Bera Gottheimer Pallone  
Beyer Green, Al (TX) Panetta  
Bishop (GA) Grijalva Pappas  
Blumenauer Harder (CA) Pascarell  
Blunt Rochester Hayes Payne  
Bonamici Higgins (NY) Perlmutter  
Bourdeaux Himes Peters  
Bowman Horsford Phillips  
Boyle, Brendan Houlihan Pingree  
F. Hoyer Pocan  
Brown (MD) Huffman Porter  
Brown (OH) Jackson Lee Pressley  
Brownley Jacobs (CA) Price (NC)  
Bush Jayapal Quigley  
Bustos Jeffries Raskin  
Butterfield Johnson (GA) Rice (NY)  
Carbajal Johnson (TX) Ross  
Cárdenas Jones Roybal-Allard  
Carson Kahele Ruiz  
Carter (LA) Kaptur Ruppertsberger  
Cartwright Keating Rush  
Case Kelly (IL) Ryan  
Casten Khanna Sánchez  
Castor (FL) Kildee Sarbanes  
Castro (TX) Kilmer Scanlon  
Cherfilus- Kim (NJ) Schakowsky  
McCormick Kind Schiff  
Chu Kirkpatrick Schneider  
Cicilline Krishnamoorthi Schrader  
Clark (MA) Kuster Schrier  
Clarke (NY) Lamb Scott (VA)  
Cleaver Langevin Scott, David  
Clyburn Larsen (WA) Sewell  
Cohen Larson (CT) Sherman  
Connolly Lawrence Sherrill  
Cooper Lawson (FL) Sires  
Correa Lee (CA) Slotkin  
Costa Lee (NV) Smith (WA)  
Courtney Leger Fernandez Soto  
Craig Levin (CA) Spanberger  
Crist Levin (MI) Speier  
Crow Lieu Stansbury  
Cuellar Lofgren Stanton  
Davids (KS) Lowenthal Stevens  
Davis, Danny K. Luria Strickland  
Dean Lynch Suozzi  
DeFazio Malinowski Swalwell  
DeGette Maloney, Takano  
DeLauro Carolyn B. Thompson (CA)  
DelBene Maloney, Sean Thompson (MS)  
Delgado Manning Titus  
Demings Matsui Tlaib  
DeSaulnier McBath Tonko  
Deutch McCollum Torres (CA)  
Dingell McEachin Torres (NY)  
Doggett McGovern Trahan  
Doyle, Michael McNerney Trone  
F. Meeks Underwood  
Escobar Meng Vargas  
Eshoo Mfume Veasey  
Espallat Moore (WI) Vela  
Evans Morelle Velázquez  
Fletcher Moulton Wasserman  
Foster Mrvan Schultz  
Frankel, Lois Murphy (FL) Waters  
Gaetz Nadler Watson Coleman

Aderholt Allen Amodei Armstrong Arrington Babin Bacon Baird Balderson Banks Barr Bentz Bergman Bice (OK) Biggs Billirakis Bishop (NC) Boebert Bost Brady Brooks Buchanan Buck Bucshon Budd Burchett Burgess Calvert Cammack Carey Carl Carter (GA) Carter (TX) Cawthorn Chabot Cheney Cline Cloud Clyde Cole Comer Crawford Crenshaw Curtis Davidson Davis, Rodney DesJarlais Diaz-Balart Donalds Duncan Dunn Elizy Emmer Estes Fallon Feenstra Ferguson Fischbach Fitzgerald Fitzpatrick Fleischmann Fortenberry Foyx Franklin, C. Scott Fulcher Gallagher Garbarino Garcia (CA) Gibbs Gimenez Gohmert Gonzales, Tony Gonzalez (OH) Good (VA) Gooden (TX) Gosar Granger Graves (LA) Graves (MO) Green (TN) Greene (GA) Griffith Grothman Guest Guthrie Harris Harshbarger Hartzler Hern Herrell Herrera Beutler Hice (GA) Higgins (LA) Hill Hinson Hollingsworth Hudson Huizenga Issa Jackson Jacobs (NY) Johnson (LA) Johnson (OH) Johnson (SD) Jordan Joyce (OH) Joyce (PA) Katko Keller Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) Kim (CA) Kinzinger Kustoff LaHood LaMalfa Lamborn Latta LaTurner Lesko Letlow Long Loudermilk Lucas Luetkemeyer Mace Malliotakis Mann Massie Mast McCarthy McCaul McClain McClintock McHenry McKinley Meijer Meuser Miller (IL) Miller (WV) Miller-Meeks Moolenaar Mooney Moore (AL) Moore (UT) Mullin Murphy (NC) Nehls Newhouse Norman Obernolte Owens Palazzo Palmer Pence Perry Pfluger Posey Reed Reschenthaler Rice (SC) Rodgers (WA) Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rose Rosendale Rouzer Roy Rutherford Salazar Scalise Schweikert Scott, Austin Sessions Simpson Smith (MO) Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smucker Spartz Stauber Steel Stefanik Steil Steube Stewart Taylor Tenney Thompson (PA) Tiffany Timmons Turner Upton Valadao Van Drew Van Deyne Wagner Walberg Walorski Waltz Weber (TX) Webster (FL) Wenstrup Westerman Williams (TX) Wilson (SC) Wittman Womack Young

NOT VOTING—1

Zeldin

□ 1638

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE

RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bass (Takano) Carter (TX) Curtis (Moore) (Nehls) (UT)  
Bowman (Garcia) Connolly Dean (Scanlon) (IL) (Wexton) DeLauro  
Brown (OH) Crenshaw (Courtney) (Aguilar) (Fallon) DeSaulnier  
Cárdenas (Gomez) Crist (Beyer)  
Carter (GA) (Wasserman) Fortenberry  
(Cammack) Schultz (Moolenaar)  
Cuellar (Correa)

Frankel, Lois (Wexton) Kirkpatrick (Pallone) Roybal-Allard (Escobar)  
Fulcher (Johnson) Lawson (FL) Rush (Evans)  
(OH) (Evans) Salazar (Moore) (UT)  
Garamendi Lesko (Miller) Schrier (Aguilar)  
(Correa) (WV) Sires (Pallone)  
Garbarino Lofgren (Aguilar) Steel (Obernolte)  
(Jacobs (NY)) (Suozi (Beyer))  
Golden Maloney, Carolyn B. Taylor (Fallon)  
(Courtney) (Wasserman) Titus (Cicilline)  
Harder (CA) (Schultz) Trone (Beyer)  
(Beyer) Neguse Upton (Katko)  
Horsford (Evans) (Perlmutter) Wagner  
Johnson (TX) Norman (McHenry)  
(Aguilar) (Donalds) Walorski  
Kahele (Mrvan) Pascrell (Bucshon)  
Kaptur (Pallone) Watson Coleman  
(Lawrence) (Pallone) (Pallone)  
Kim (NJ) Payne (Pallone) Welch (Pallone)  
(Pallone) Porter (Wexton) Wilson (FL)  
Kinzinger Rodgers (WA) (Cicilline)  
(Meijer) (Bilirakis)

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 77, in the Second Session of the 117th Congress, on H.R. 6434, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

## LOWERING ENERGY COSTS WITH TRANSFORMATIVE INVESTMENTS

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because my constituents, like all Americans, are paying far too much at the pump. They are angry, and so am I.

In response to Vladimir Putin's unprovoked invasion of Ukraine, President Biden rightly imposed crippling sanctions on Russia to bankrupt Putin's war machine and sever Russia's ties to the global war economy. That was the right move, and Russia is feeling the punishment from those sanctions. But, unfortunately, so are the American people.

The American people are willing to do their part in support of Ukrainians, who are fighting for their survival, fighting for their independence. But the fact is, we are too dependent on foreign autocrats for their oil and gas. It leaves us vulnerable to supply chain constraints and gives tyrants like Putin too much power over our way of life.

But with transformative investments in clean energy and electric vehicles, we could take back control, lower energy costs, and protect our national security.

That is why we need substantial tax credits so that all families can afford electric vehicles. To power them, we must bolster our clean energy production from solar wind and other renewable sources.

These investments will shake our reliance on fossil fuels, create good-paying jobs, and shield us from energy price shocks like we are feeling right now. We simply have no time to waste.

## BIDEN'S ENERGY AND INFLATION CRISES

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, higher prices at the gas pump directly result from President Biden's actions.

On his first days in office, he canceled the Keystone pipeline; he ended new oil and gas leases on Federal lands; and he is attempting to regulate the industry out of existence by way of executive orders.

But don't worry, President Biden's administration has offered some words of encouragement for Americans struggling to pay outrageous prices at the pump.

Last week, the Secretary of Transportation said to those Americans upset about paying outrageous gas prices that "communities can all benefit from the gas savings of driving an electric vehicle."

Did someone forget to mention to the Secretary that the average cost of an electric vehicle is \$50,000, which, frankly, is far more than the yearly household income of many middle Tennesseans?

Even Elon Musk, the founder of the electric vehicle maker Tesla, understands that electric vehicles cannot solve this immediate crisis. Maybe he should lead the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one solution to President Biden's energy crisis: reverse these disastrous executive orders and unleash America's energy independence.

□ 1645

#### SUPPORT THE BLACK AND BROWN MIGRANTS AROUND THE WORLD

(Ms. TLAIB asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TLAIB. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of Black and Brown migrants around the world. Putin's invasion of Ukraine is horrific, and my heart is with the millions of families who have been displaced and those who have lost their lives.

I must highlight the refugee crisis caused by the war that has exposed a double standard. Black and Brown migrants fleeing Ukraine are being forced to the back of the line and turned away at European borders. This reminds me of what happened this past September at our own border when the U.S. Customs and Border Patrol used excessive force and life-threatening tactics in a racially-charged manner against unarmed Haitians. Simply put, we must demand better.

President Biden and the administration must raise this issue with European leaders at every opportunity, and act to ensure that everyone, regardless of their color, their skin, their faith, and their ethnicity can find safety from this violent conflict.

#### RECOGNIZING NATIONAL RED CROSS MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize March as National Red Cross Month. Since 1943, March has been recognized as Red Cross Month. The Red Cross was founded by Clara Barton in 1881 with the noble mission of preventing and easing human suffering.

Since its creation, the Red Cross has grown to one of the largest organizations in the country. Their efforts span from disaster relief, lifesaving blood collections, international services, and assistance with military families and veterans. In our current state of the world, the Red Cross is actively assisting with humanitarian efforts in Ukraine.

The Red Cross is able to carry out their mission because of their vast and strong network of volunteers, donors, and partners. Whether help is needed in big cities or the smallest towns, the Red Cross is always ready to provide assistance.

Mr. Speaker, during American Red Cross Month, let's renew our commitment to the timeless ideals of caring for one another.

#### STOP THE WAR IN UKRAINE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today during the debate dealing with removing the normal trade relations from Russia and Belarus, I indicated that "slaughter" is too nice a word to describe the actions of Vladimir Putin against the innocent people of Ukraine. I insist on that definition. One Member rose and said it was genocide. Certainly, it is near that devastating and deadly system that we have seen used elsewhere.

As Russian soldiers come home in body bags and as Russian mothers begin to mourn, I make this plea to the Russian people: This is an illegal war. Putin is a war criminal. We can only now count on you. The Western world has done every single thing that they can do to stop the pillage, the violence, the killing of pregnant women, the slaughtering of babies in the street.

It is time now for the Russian people to unleash the shackles around your mind and your hands, to be able to stand up and say to Putin—who is now leading your country into an end that you will never, never, never forget or be forgiven for.

Why don't you stand up and speak eloquently to stop this violence and this war, to ask for peace, to get to the peace table, and make a difference in Russia saving lives, and for the people of Ukraine.

#### GAS PRICES HIT AN ALL-TIME HIGH

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, gas prices have hit an all-time high, averaging over \$4 nationally for the first time since 2008. The rising price of fuel, groceries, and just about everything are an assault on the pocketbooks of working families, and it is all a direct result of President Biden's failed energy policies.

Under the Trump administration we were energy independent for the first time in my lifetime. But within just his first few days in office, President Biden reversed all the progress that we made.

Yesterday, we heard from President Zelenskyy who urged President Biden to do more to support Ukraine as they defend themselves from Russia. While banning Russian oil imports is a vital first step, another way to support Ukraine is by unleashing American energy so we can help make the world less reliant on Putin and dictators who use the profits from oil exports to fund their malign activities.

President Biden would rather pay dictators than Americans all in the name of climate change. What happened to Made in America? For the sake of our Nation and our European allies who could use an alternative to Russian fuel, I hope he listens to the American people—let's make America energy independent again.

#### REMEMBERING JARED LLOYD

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, March 23 marks 1 year since the tragic passing of my constituent, Jared Lloyd, whose memory I wish to honor today.

Mr. Lloyd was a volunteer firefighter with the Hillcrest Fire Department in the village of Spring Valley, New York, where I grew up. On March 23 of last year, Jared Lloyd died a hero. He sacrificed his life to rescue residents of Evergreen Court Home for Adults from a horrific fire.

Jared's colleagues have said that he saved as many as 30 lives that day. I know that I speak on behalf of the people of Rockland County when I say that I cannot express how incredibly proud I am of him for his bravery and his selflessness, and how sad I am over his loss.

Jared Lloyd was 35 years old. He was a son, a companion, and a loving father of two wonderful children, Logan and Darius. Jared was a schoolmate of mine. He was a graduate of Spring Valley High School. He had so much life left to live. He will never be forgotten. Today, he is remembered in the House of Representatives for his heroic actions.



## ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening as the proud daughter of New Mexico to discuss the transformative impacts of the American Rescue Plan for our State on this beautiful St. Patrick's Day during Women's History Month to highlight the impacts the American Rescue Plan has had for our working families, our kids, and for our entire Nation.

It has been a difficult year—a difficult several years—as our communities have experienced the impacts of the pandemic and the economic struggles that have come with it. When we think back to even a year ago, last year at this time, we were unable to gather safely, unemployment was at an all-time high, so many of our families were struggling, and businesses closed.

One year ago, this body passed the American Rescue Plan. One year later, people are still struggling in our country, and supply chains and our economy are still recovering, but so much has changed. Our economy is growing at a faster rate than at any point since the 1980s. More jobs have been created in 1 year than ever in our Nation's history. Wages are up and more small businesses are opening up across the country than ever before.

Because the American Rescue Plan changed the way in which families put food on the table, provide for their families so that our parents, and women in particular, can return to work and has helped our schools stay open and our families and small businesses stay afloat.

Let's get to the heart of the matter today, which is how this particular piece of legislation has transformed the lives of so many New Mexicans and how our communities have benefitted from these historic policies.

The people of New Mexico, especially our women, are strong, resilient centers of our families, and the roots of our communities. Our women carry us, nurture us, and work hard every day so that we can succeed—like the women in my own life, my own mother, my sister, and the trailblazing women who came before us and support us every day in our communities.

But the challenges and burdens of this pandemic in the past 2 years have fallen unequally and disproportionately on women who have exited the workforce in unprecedented numbers, and on our kids who are resilient, yet still struggling.

As families struggle to make ends meet, keep a roof over their heads, and put food on the table, women have had to dig deep and find creative solutions.

These burdens have fallen disproportionately, in particular, on our Latina and Hispano women, on our indigenous women, our Black women, and women struggling economically every day to make ends meet.

There are countless stories of struggle and resilience and survival in our communities and the impacts of the American Rescue Plan. One from New Mexico's First Congressional District is that of April Trujillo and her four boys in Albuquerque.

After losing her husband in September of 2020, Derrick Trujillo, a small business owner, who owned a small carpet cleaning business, their family struggled in a way that they had never done so before. They were ultimately able to keep a roof over their heads and keep food on the table because of the transformative impacts of the child tax credit and rental assistance programs provided by the American Rescue Plan.

It is by no means a stretch to say that these programs helped to catch this family as they faced potentially becoming homeless at one of the most difficult moments in their life. That is exactly what this American Rescue Plan was designed to do and why we must put these transformational investments in childcare, in the child tax credit, in housing, in food assistance, and our community well-being, and continue them into the future.

They catch families like the Trujillo family when they need it most. It will help to lift up Americans who are facing economic struggles and create opportunities for families for generations to come.

As we celebrate the 1-year anniversary of the American Rescue Plan and celebrate the passage of the historic infrastructure package a few months ago, and crucial budget legislation just this last week, these bills have had a transformational impact on our economy, on jobs, and families across the country, and we acknowledge that the work is not over.

We must extend the child tax credit. We must expand programs to tackle housing and hunger. We must invest in a universal childcare system and caring for our elders. We must tackle drought and climate change. We must stand with Ukraine and global democracy. This is the work ahead and we stand together united to get it done.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have been taught and told from an African proverb that when a tall tree falls in the forest it makes a lot of noise, it gathers a lot of attention, everybody and every entity in the forest knows that something has happened.

A few days ago, a tall tree fell in the "Chicagoland" community where I live. A gentleman, Mr. Pervis Spann, spent the last day of his life. Pervis Spann, to all of us, is known as the "blues man" because he was a great artist who projected, promoted, and entertained us for years.

□ 1700

Pervis was born in Itta Bena, Mississippi. Like many other African Americans who were born in Itta Bena, Mississippi, and anyone else in Mississippi, individuals migrated to other places. Thousands and thousands and thousands of them made their way to Chicago, Illinois.

As a matter of fact, we fondly say that the only place where there are more Mississippians than there are in Chicago is in Mississippi itself. Many individuals left the delta area. So did Pervis Spann. He went to Michigan; worked in Gary, Indiana; and joined the military. But eventually he made his way to Chicago.

He came to Chicago and used his GI Bill to go to broadcasting school, and he got to be very good at it, not only as a broadcaster but also as a promoter.

Ultimately, the Stack brothers bought a radio station, and they named that station WVON. Eventually Mr. Pervis Spann, Vernon Jarrett, Wesley South and a woman named Gwendolyn Hayes ended up acquiring the station. Spann was the blues part of it. As a matter of fact, he entertained and promoted, entertained and promoted.

The station also became a pioneer in talk radio. As a matter of fact, before there was talk radio, Wesley South, one of the partners, had a talk radio program called "On Target". And this was years and years and years ago. "On Target". It is hard to believe that talk now dominates in many places. So WVON was a pioneer of talk radio.

It also has become the powerhouse of communication in the Chicagoland area, especially for African Americans. Talk all day long about whatever is going on in the community, whatever is going on in Chicago, and whatever is going on in the world, WVON. As a matter of fact, many of my neighbors and friends wait to wake up in the morning so that they can listen to WVON especially, beginning at 6:00 o'clock in the morning.

But not only was Pervis Spann a tremendous promoter, but he also was a tremendous businessman period. Ultimately the station came into the hands of his daughter, Melody Spann-Cooper, who has taken it to new heights. If it is not heard on VON, it did not happen if it was not part of the discussion on WVON. So it is much more than entertainment. It is the community's town-hall all day long, every day, whatever it is, WVON leads the way.

So I simply wanted to express condolences to his family on his passing and also let his family know how much Pervis Spann has meant to Chicago, how much it has meant to the socialization of the community, how much it has meant to the business promotion of the community, and how much it has meant to the spirituality of the community. On Sunday afternoons there is kind of a gospel-political atmosphere created, so that some people can hardly wait to get home from church so they can turn on VON so they can listen to

the "Gospel with Pam Morris Walton" show.

So Pervis may have been the bluesman, and he may have entertained all the greats. Pervis Spann was noted and known as the person who named Aretha Franklin the "Queen of Soul". He gave her that designation, and it stuck. So Melody will carry on in the tradition of her father as VON is the voice not just of the Negro—that was what the VON stood for—but the voice of the Nation, WVON, Pervis Spann.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this month is Women's History Month, and we celebrate Women's History Month because of the tremendous progress that has been made.

I am always reminded that when a group of men sat in the room and stated that we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, they didn't really mean all men. They meant some men. They meant the men whom they felt had enough knowledge, enough resources, and enough interests to make decisions for the country. Therefore, all men were not in the room.

As a matter of fact, African-American men who were in slave States were not even considered as a full man. African-American slaves were considered as three-fifths. They had something called the three-fifths compromise which meant that they would only count African-American slaves as three-fifths of a person when they were counting up for the Census, not all men and no women.

As a matter of fact, women didn't get the right to vote in this country until a little more than 100 years ago. Yet, as a result of suffrage, protests, struggle, and changes, now a woman is the Vice President of the United States. So there has been movement, although not nearly enough and not nearly what there has to be. So the struggle will continue so that ultimately there will be levels of equity in this country for women, Blacks, and other citizens who don't have it and have not had it.

The woman that I chose to mention at this time is a woman, Merri Dee, who was an icon in broadcasting and philanthropy. Merri Dee was born in Chicago in 1936, the youngest of six children. She was only 2 years old when her mother died. Her father ultimately became sick and, of course, he had remarried. She was adopted by her stepmother, and she maintained that life was pretty rough for her until she got to the fifth grade and met a wonderful teacher who helped to change her life.

She stated in an interview that this teacher, a Mrs. Robinson, told her that she would be great. She believed in that teacher, and then she went on and became great.

She graduated from Englewood High School, went back to New Orleans and enrolled in Xavier University where she studied business administration. She, of course, dropped out and took a job at IBM to help her other brothers

and sisters. She then worked, got married, got divorced, had a daughter, got a good job, and she just felt that she was spending too much time away at her job and from her child, so she quit that job, and somebody told her: You have a gift for gab.

She decided to study broadcasting and journalism.

She did, and she got so good at it, eventually she got her first show, a radio show. She did that for a bit, and then she got a television show, became excellent at it, and became one of the top female broadcasters in the United States.

As a matter of fact, she was so good, she did that, then she ran into a little difficulty. She and one of her guests were kidnapped leaving the show, robbed, shot, left for dead, and with two bullets in her head she crawled up to the highway where someone picked her up, took her to the hospital, and she stayed hospitalized for a year.

As a matter of fact, she was told that she wouldn't make it and had two last rites given to her, one by the Reverend Jesse Jackson who was indeed a friend of hers. But she prevailed and lived and was in the hospital for a year. She came back, got hired by WGN Television, and she became an anchor. She did that for 11 years. Then they asked her to take the job as director of community relations and public affairs and their children's charities, and she did.

She generated \$31 million for the charities and for the philanthropic work. She just kept doing it. I have never known anybody who was more open and more giving. I must have gone to at least hundreds of charitable events over the years where Merri Dee was the announcer. She was the facilitator. She was the person making it happen.

So when we design and define what greatness is, Merri Dee was obviously a great woman, a great broadcaster, a tremendous communicator, and a person who could stir audiences and groups and convince people to give thousands of dollars for needy causes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I salute Merri Dee. I salute her, and I revere her. I know that if people go up that way, that she is up there walking among the angels and putting on events and activities and waiting for other people to come.

□ 1715

REMEMBERING HAROLD WASHINGTON

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, finally, I will mention, although it is Women's History Month, I will mention now an African-American male who was a transformative figure in the life, especially of a big city that was the third largest city in the United States of America, a gentleman named Harold Washington, who became the first African-American mayor of the city of Chicago.

Harold, if he was alive now, would be celebrating his 100th birthday. He would be 100 years old.

Harold was a transformative figure in the political life of Chicago. Chicago

was known as the city of the big shoulders, known as many things. But it was a patronage-laden city. Patronage guided the politics of Chicago.

For a long time, it had a tradition that if somebody went to city hall or to State government or county government to get a job, the saying was: "Don't bring nobody, didn't nobody see it," basically meaning that unless you had a letter from a ward boss or from some elected official who was part of the system, even if it was a job that you had ten times the qualifications for, you wouldn't get it. You wouldn't get it because you didn't have the hook-up; you didn't have the connection.

We actually convinced Harold Washington, I am sure, to run for mayor. He had become a Member of Congress. He had been the Democratic lead on the voting rights bill. Of course, in the mid '60s and '70s, that was still hot, just as it is hot today.

It is amazing that we can't get the voting rights extension granted, especially when all politicians in this country basically suggest that they believe in democracy, that they believe in democratic principles, and that they believe that everybody should have a right to participate and express themselves. Then we go through this process of wrangling to make it happen.

But somehow or another, there seems to be a block. I don't know; maybe people have changed their minds from what they learned in grammar school or in high school or what they read in the Constitution and all of that. It seems that way.

Nevertheless, Harold Washington was convinced by people like Lou Palmer, people like Vernon Jarrett, people like myself and others, to run for the mayor of the city of Chicago. He said: Well, if you guys really want me to run for mayor, you have got to show it. If you don't show it, I won't do it. You have got to get some people registered to vote, and you have got to raise some money.

I remember sitting in a room in Lou Palmer's basement, eating watermelon, as a matter of fact, about 10 or 12 of us. We then said to Harold Washington: Well, Harold, you can go on to your next meeting. And we set out to generate the conditions and meet the conditions that he had set.

Harold was so astute, such a charmer, such an intellectual, but he also liked to walk the streets and talk to people in the alley and talk to people who other people probably wouldn't.

I never will forget that I had set up a meeting with a bunch of motorcycle riders for Harold to go to, and some of his campaign people didn't want him to come. Motorcycle riders, the Born Losers, the Buzzing Bees, and Dragons. Harold said: I will be there. Of course, he came, and everybody had donned their leather jackets and all those things.

After he got elected, we ended up with some plaques that the motorcycle

riders gave to Harold and to me. I don't know what happened to his. Mine is still around.

But when Harold got elected, the city council organized against him. There were 29 people on the other side and 21 of us. We called it the 29-21. Ultimately, we ended up with a 25-25 split. Every item that came up, there would be 25 votes for it and 25 votes against it. Then, of course, Harold would get a chance to break the tie.

He had such a sense of fairness that he went all over the city assuring every community that they would be treated the same as every other community, that they would get a part of the infrastructure money, that their schools would be prepared, and that their sidewalks would be repaired and fixed.

He became bigger than life. As a matter of fact, when Harold died, people celebrated in the streets and spent days walking through to pay reverence. That is because he helped people understand that government belonged to them, and they did not necessarily belong to government.

When people ask what was the transformation, the transformation was that the patronage system was seriously diminished. The transformation was the greatest participation, in terms of turnout in elections, would occur, because the people felt that they had somebody in the highest office who respected and recognized what they had to say.

Harold would stop on the street and have a townhall, and 15, 20 people would gather around. It wasn't his intent to stop on the street. He just stopped and would spend time.

Someone asked me what was one of my fondest memories or stories about Harold Washington. I told them it was the fact that I drove a car for 19 years. In 19 years, the car had sort of rusted in the floor, and I put a plank there. We were someplace and Harold wanted a ride to tell me something or ask me something, so he told his guys to go ahead and he was going to ride to the next stop with me. When he got in the car, the plank had shifted. He looked down and said: "What the . . ."

I said: "Mr. Mayor, don't worry about that. Just push that plank back over, and you won't even know that there is no floor."

He said: "Why don't you buy yourself a car?" Well, I didn't get one right then. Eventually, I did.

Harold Washington transformed the politics of Chicago. Harold Washington gave being an elected official in Chicago a new meaning, that it was not just about glad handing and backslapping. It was about trying to serve and serving the people.

Harold, you did your job, you did it well, and we pray tribute to you even during Women's History Month.

RECOGNIZING CHICAGO'S UKRAINIAN VILLAGE

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to close, I can't help but be reminded that I represent a

community in Chicago that we fondly call Ukrainian Village. That is because most of the people there are of Ukrainian heritage.

We have a rally every week. We have everything that you can possibly have, with the hope and with the faith that our President, that our country, will stay on the course. We have no doubt that we will continue to protect Ukraine as a part of the humanity that this country, "My Country, 'Tis of Thee," needs to express, because we know that so goes Ukraine, so goes the other countries nearby, and, ultimately, so will go the United States of America.

Ukraine is a part of us. We are a part of Ukraine. Together, I think we will beat back the murderous, cowardly pact. We will be pressed to the wall, but always, as Claude McKay would say, always, always fighting back.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### WHAT GOOD HAS BEEN DONE IN THE LAST YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRES of New York). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to apologize right now, because I have had a lot of coffee, and I am just cranky today. I am just cranky. I also apologize for those who have to try to keep track. I will, on occasion, try to slow down. I torment them on occasion by talking too fast.

I started to do part of this a week ago and only wanted to do a little part, but we have a 10 o'clock shutdown rule, so I got up against the clock and had to stop. So, God forbid, they let me have the entire hour, which means I brought a whole bunch of boards.

A week ago, I pitched to some of our friends here a really mean, difficult, and absolutely honest question: Tell me something good that has been done in the last year of absolute control of Congress, of the White House, and of, functionally, the levers of our Government. Tell us something good that has been done policy-wise, legislative-wise, that has passed here for working men and women, for the future of my 6-year-old daughter, for people's retirement security, what has actually happened here.

Then I am going to walk through a whole bunch of things where the words, the virtue signaling, the discussion had great language, warm and fuzzy and caring, and it has actually been devastating to poor people, to the working poor.

I don't think they meant to, but the fact of the matter is, at some point, my brothers and sisters on the left have to have a brutally honest conversation with themselves of what their policies are doing.

We are going to start with, being from a border State, immigration. But it is not immigration. It is opening up the border. What has the Democrats' policy, what has this President's policy, on functionally ignoring the border, done to my community in Arizona and to the country.

□ 1730

First, let's also get our heads around the scale of the numbers when you start seeing that border encounters increased 278 percent, functionally, in a year, when you start seeing numbers over 1.7 million crossings, when you start seeing crossings that are in the millions.

But do you remember all the speechifying that was here a year ago? Do you remember how mean the last President was? We are going to be compassionate and loving.

Does anyone here understand the economic concept of first degree, second degree, third degree effects, what you have done to my communities in Phoenix, what you have done to the communities in this country? Let's show the actual math.

Now, I also have an economic premise, and we have done this presentation multiple times. They were written by liberal economists that talked about the two things you do to make the working poor poorer.

Number one was inflation. Well, congratulations. We are going to talk about that.

Number two was open borders, and it was a very simple concept. If you look at the profile of our brothers and sisters who we would categorize—and I hate these categories, but we do them for policy purposes—who are considered the working poor, they are often our brothers and sisters who did not graduate high school, who sell their labor. That is their income.

You open up the border and import millions of individuals who their economic contribution will be to sell their labor. One of these economic papers, written a decade ago, says you have just taken the working poor in the country and made them poor for another decade. One of them talks about that their income, at the end of the decade, will be at least 6 percent lower.

For all those folks that like to preach about compassion, where is the compassion for those who are just grinding it out, trying to survive here? Do you understand that, at some point, the math always wins?

Let's have a little fun here. Here is my premise, and I am going to try to do this on a number of these boards.

You open up the border. We are going to talk about how many of our brothers and sisters and families and the kids in my community and across this country are now dying of fentanyl.

I did a ride-along a month ago with one of my neighbors who happens to be a police sergeant in a portion of north central Phoenix. He is telling me that, a year ago—and I am not going to get

these numbers exactly right. It was like \$70 to \$100 for that addict to get high, and now it might be \$12.

Remember your basic economics classes. When a price crashes, what does that mean? The availability has skyrocketed.

We are also going to talk a little bit about—I have ZIP Codes in my community where the social workers, the charities, some of my churches are telling me homelessness has doubled in 1 year. Have you seen the crime numbers? We have to deal with reality.

Then, we probably should have an interesting conversation. What makes poor communities poorer? If you have made drugs available, if you have flooded the communities with homelessness, if now you have also increased crime—and do you see the death numbers of our brothers and sisters who are dying of drugs?

Are we willing to have a basic understanding—when you make a really crappy decision that we are not going to enforce the border because it is more compassionate, do you understand the cascade of misery that the left has brought to many of their own constituencies?

The fact of the matter is, a lot of these neighborhoods that are suffering this aren't the ones voting for me. But, dammit, I care because their misery should be all of ours, except it is not politically expedient around here because it basically proves the rhetoric: Let's defund the police. Let's defund ICE.

Great job, guys. Look what you did to your neighborhoods. Look what you did to our communities. Look at the misery. Look at the death you brought. And the math will always win.

For every Member and staffer who may be on one of the televisions around this campus, if you are watching, I want you to have the experience I have had where you have to pick up the phone and talk to a mother who had their child die because they thought they were taking some party drug, and it turned out to have fentanyl in it.

That is the misery. And you are on that phone, and the tears are running down, and you are terrified.

I have a 6½-year-old, the greatest gift God has ever given me. I am terrified that this is the society that you get when you put the left in charge.

Did they mean this? The rhetoric doesn't say so, but, dammit, will they actually stop and take a look at the outcome of their decisions?

When you see a 133 percent increase, people in our communities are dying. They come behind these microphones and tell us how they are the ones that care. Fine. Maybe you should be on the next phone call with me when you are talking to that mother. You can explain to them that it was compassion to open up the border and make it so drug prices crash, so now fentanyl comes screaming into my community, and their child gets to die.

There are consequences to really bad policy. It may have been great rhetoric when you had a different President, but the misery has been foisted on our neighborhoods, our suburbs, our communities, and particularly the communities that the Democrats claim they care about.

If you look at what is going on, on the drug overdoses—by the way, I brought this because, believe it or not, for anyone watching, there are rules where I can't reach over here and write on this, so we did something sort of silly. We had to print it and put some tape on it.

There is your number for 2021, and that is only as of October. We don't have the final data. So, congratulations, Democrats. Over 100,000 of our brothers and sisters are dead, of our children, of our next generation. And there are still a couple more months to be added to that math.

I don't believe it is purposeful, but I believe there is an embarrassment of saying, oh, God, what have we done? The number of times around this place you make a policy decision, you campaign on it, it is in your brochures, you have given speeches, and then you find out it crashes and burns and creates more misery, that willingness to get up behind a microphone and say: I am wrong.

I have had a couple of those, where I thought I understood the math. I thought I understood the societal implications. I am waiting.

Now, we did hear a little bit of it. I was optimistic. The President got behind that microphone up ahead of me and said: Let's fund the police.

You could hear the grumbling of a number of our brothers and sisters on this side because they had campaigned on something very different for years.

Now, let's talk about other levels of crime, and this is not my area of specialty. I do Medicare finance. I do trade. I do taxes. I love working on the geeky stuff. Yes, it doesn't get you on television. You don't raise lots of money because you said something crazy, but it is important. It is what keeps the economy going. It is what keeps prosperity, and I believe economic growth is moral.

But we have been working on a side project on the Joint Economic Committee, and here is our outline. What makes people poor?

Well, you get people that say, oh, education, racism. You start looking at the data sets and truly grinding in, and then things we could do something about, and you start seeing things that pop off the data if you are willing to open your eyes and own a calculator.

Diabetes actually pops off as one of the top things when you see the concentrations of our brothers and sisters with diabetes.

When you actually see crime—and this is one that almost is never talked about here. Communities often that have the most economic misery, is it a chicken and the egg? It is a little hard

to get ahead in life when people keep stealing stuff or killing your family members.

Maybe it is time. Reagan, back in the 1980 election, had something called the misery index. It was, functionally, inflation and unemployment. Maybe it is time we could do something much more effective and create the Biden and Democrat-controlled misery index. We could just lay out how many of our brothers and sisters are OD'ing, how many of our brothers and sisters are dying, how many of our brothers and sisters are victims of crime, how many of our brothers and sisters are sicker today, how many of our brothers and sisters now have mental health issues because they spent a couple of years locked up, how many of our kids are almost afraid to take their masks off now.

Think about the sort of psychodrama that this place has foisted on the citizens of this country. And the hits keep coming.

Look, I put this one here more just as a—and I know I am being a bit snarky, but I have to get it off my chest. The number of get-togethers I had a year ago, so during 2020, and fussing and screaming: Why aren't you doing more about COVID? If we had Democrats in charge, people would be healthier. We would solve the problem.

Do you remember President Biden's campaign promises? Do you remember the Democrat leadership's promises here? Put us in charge. We will take care of it.

So, a time where there are therapeutics, a time where there are vaccines, you did a great job, guys, a great job. Because do you see the math? A hell of a lot more of our brothers and sisters died in a time where we actually had the tools.

What happened? My argument is rhetoric sure does sound a lot better than actually explaining competence.

Now, let's talk about—in my 8 minutes I had last week, it was basically trying to have a conversation of what the Democrats have done making the environment worse. And you go, huh?

The fact of the matter—and I will show you the slide here in a moment. As soon as the Biden administration took over—but it even goes back to 2018 when the Democrats won the House.

They basically set off a campaign or jihad, whatever colloquialism you want to use, and it wasn't, hey, we are just going to cancel pipelines. What was it? In 2020, President Biden, in a debate with BERNIE SANDERS, said there will be no more permitting. No more permitting of pipelines. No more permitting of wells. It was an absolute promise.

Well, to his credit, he kept his promise. But did anyone stop for a moment to think about what they were going to do?

So, functionally, what is ESG? I can give you the quote, or we can just do something really simple. It is when you

basically add such a risk premium to investing in any type of hydrocarbons.

So, you are a pension system, you are our pension systems, you are the California teachers, you are a mutual fund, you are an index fund, and you are going to now have to, with all the threats and things coming through the administration—this isn't votes. This isn't a proclamation from the President. This is the infrastructure of our society and our financial markets basically raising a risk premium for investing in natural gas, for investing in the infrastructure of hydrocarbons. Well, what happens?

□ 1745

What happens when you do that? Because remember, it wasn't the invasion of Ukraine by Russia. Go back to last September and October when natural gas prices shot off the charts, and there were people here coming—people on the left—you know, attacking hydrocarbon and natural gas companies. But the fact of the matter is, we were talking about how miserable this winter was going to be, what was happening to your fuel prices.

And look, I have never actually seen heating oil. I am from the desert. I have lived in the desert my entire life. I have seen pictures of it. And then you see people saying it is two, three, four times more expensive for these people to heat their homes, and then you also realize the ZIP Codes they live in and how they vote for. They voted for it.

But the reality of it is, there is a punch line here. When Democrat policy drove up the price of natural gas so high that power generation all across North America converted back to coal, you realize the United States burnt 23 percent more coal last year.

I mean, did anyone just do the basic math? Okay. You are going to engage in policies that make natural gas dramatically more expensive. The next least expensive fuel, all of a sudden, became coal. Congratulations.

Now, during President Trump's time, the use of coal—and this was a guy who claimed to be a coal supporter—went down dramatically because natural gas crashed in price. Remember, the last 15 years, the movement we had to become dramatically less carbon-centric, you know, greenhouse gas formula, heading towards—for those who cared about the math on the Paris accords, was almost exclusively, exclusively the use of natural gas because, remember, we took off so much baseload nuclear, we took off more baseload nuclear in the United States in the previous 15 years than we actually did produce new photovoltaic and wind. So if someone says, oh, it is because of all the clean energy generation. No, it is actually because of natural gas displacing coal. I mean, the math is the math.

This one we need to share. Anyone notice if you were here—and this is even for the poor staff here, please don't move your eyes or anything because someone will take a shot at you

for it—a couple weeks ago, before the State of the Union, we came to the floor here, we had to wear masks. Then we all hear about polling being done by the White House and the Democrat leadership, and all of a sudden, we find out, hey, turns out the public is over it, even Democrat-based voters are pretty much over the enforcement of mask mandates, and did you notice pretty much a little bit after the Impact Research poll that the Democrats did, 48 hours later after the poll was published, guess what happened? I don't have to wear a mask on the floor anymore.

Policy by virtue signaling instead of a calculator, it is theater. Welcome to how this Congress has been run. It happened. It happened. Look, I am not the only one to point this out. Even a number of leftist publications said: Isn't it just amazing, as soon as the Democrats got a poll that it no longer was popular even with their base, all the masks come off?

Even the people, even the experience of a couple of the Democrat matriarchs that fussed at me not to get into an elevator with them because I wasn't wearing a mask in the hallway, which I was very respectful, I didn't, 48 hours later didn't care that I was in the elevator with them without a mask because the polling said it was okay. I am happy to know we now make public health policy on the Democrat side with polling. But it is real. It happened.

So let's actually have a little bit more fun here. The absurdity of Democrat policy. Guess when statutorily—the Democrats passed this about 3 weeks ago, they set a date. They set a date when the pandemic will be over. Not based on science, not based even on their polling. They set a date. Congratulations, it is September 30, 2025.

Two years ago, when we were actually working together on this, we had a collective understanding we were worried that emergency rooms, hospitals were going to be just packed, we wouldn't have enough ventilators, we were racing for vaccines. We didn't have antivirals. But there was, I thought, a collective societal that we declare a pandemic.

Do you remember 15 days to slow the spread? We will all stay home for 15 days, slow the spread. And here we are a couple years later. We have antivirals; we have vaccines; we have therapeutics; we understand the virus; and the policy set is to make September 30, 2025.

Now, we should actually let whoever is watching know the joke. It is about the money. This place is always about the money. There are lots and lots and lots of special spending line items that come with the declaration of a pandemic, and this pretty much locks in saying, hey, you know, this person may hate vaccine passports or hate masks or this and that, but wink wink, nod nod we have made sure the declaration of the pandemic is until 2025 so we can

keep getting the largesse of the SPIFs on the cash. If that is what it is, tell the truth. Say, look, you know, we buy our elections by handouts through our policies here. Okay. But tell the truth.

I have a personal fixation on diabetes, and I have done speeches, presentation after presentation on this, and I want to walk through why. Look, we will come back to this two or three times.

This slide, the numbers are much higher now because this slide is from a year ago because the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, hasn't given us an update. But 29 years from now, we are scheduled to have \$112 trillion of borrowing, and that is in today's dollars, so adjusted for inflation. Functionally, 75 percent of that spending is Medicare. 31 percent of all Medicare spending is diabetes. 33 percent of all healthcare spending in the United States is diabetic related. I represent, I believe, the second highest percentage of population, one of my Tribal communities that I represent—I love them dearly—they are number two in, we think the world, in the percentage of their members who have diabetes, and their sister Tribe is number one.

Come to my community sometime. I will take you out in the community, introduce you to some of the families I have known my whole life, and grandma has her foot cut off.

So the President did something a lot of people cheered for: Hey, insulin is outrageously expensive, we are going to subsidize it. Okay. Fine. Fine.

Does anyone on the Democrat side actually read any of the healthcare, the pharmaceutical, the science journals? The facility is almost up and running where it is a co-op. If they actually cared about crashing the price of insulin, someone would have paid attention that it is already here. This stuff is about to roll out.

A number of the pharmacies and hospitals got together and said: Screw this, we are going to use a market. We are going to go around, and we are going to make it ourselves, and we are going to do direct sales. They are talking about no more than \$30 per vial, \$55 per box. It is not requiring government subsidies, regulations, because you know how efficiently that works: We will subsidize it, but the cost of the bureaucracy to do it will be a nightmare.

But does anyone pay attention? I was here about 3 weeks ago talking about if the left really wants to be compassionate—and I can get my brothers and sisters on the right to be loving and compassionate—we know how to cure type 1, at least that is what the science journals are saying. We have figured out how to take a stem cell and direct it to become—I always mispronounce it—an islet cell to produce insulin. There is now even a new version where the taking of that cell and adjusting it with CRISPR so the body doesn't see it as foreign so you can actually have a constant line.

Wouldn't it be miraculous if you actually had some thinking people here

that said: Screw this, instead of patching up people's misery, we are going to subsidize insulin so you can live in misery, just cheaper?

And back to my previous comments that we have been working on a model about what creates income inequality, what creates poverty? We are actually seeing health and crime and these things. Hold it. We know diabetes is actually for our brothers, the urban poor, my Tribal poor, rural poor, is truly everywhere. If you cared, wouldn't you throw everything you have at this concept of, okay, we know how to cure type 1?

The articles, if you read through them—and some of it is thick—is, yeah, the same concept, you could take someone with type 2 and get their body to produce insulin again, but you would actually have to have them engage in much healthier life practices. Would we be willing to have the really brutal conversation here of we are going to change how the farm bill works, we are going to change how nutrition support works, and those who would actually like to see a future where their diabetes type 2 is cured, would they be willing to work with their community to eat different? Would we be willing to work on that? Would we be willing to deliver, have Lyft deliver food boxes to the home and say we are loving, caring about your future and your health, and we don't want you to be like the grandma who is a friend of mine who has had her foot cut off? And if you will do this, the societal trade will be, we will do the stem cell to islet cell to get your body back to producing insulin.

And, oh, by the way, diabetes is the single biggest contributor to U.S. sovereign debt. So for those who are fiscal hawks, great. For those who actually give a darn about people, wonderful.

And, instead, our solution coming from our President standing right there is: I am going to subsidize insulin. I am not going to cure the misery; I am just going to make it cheaper. Where's the vision here?

So now let's actually go back to the previous, the two things you do most to make the working poor poor. Okay. We talked about opening the border, making them compete with others with similar skill sets. My numbers are already out of date because it keeps getting worse. You also crush them by making everything they buy—because if you are poor, if you are that working middle class, if you are just hard-working middle class, the amount of your income that goes to food, the amount of your income that goes to rent, the amount of your income that goes to driving is substantially more than the vast majority of the people in this body.

The income we are paid, we are in the top quartile. And then we also have some of the richest people you can imagine that are here, and it is always funny hearing them talk about—when they are worth millions and millions

and millions of dollars, but to the family that is struggling out there, this has been a really crappy year.

I will point it out, and I am going to do it a couple times. Guess which community had the highest inflation rate in the United States? Mine. I had 10.9 percent in my neighborhoods. You want to talk about kicking people in the head? That is year over year. This is what unified Democrat government has brought you. You are poorer today than the day Joe Biden took office.

And then the hallmark here used to be, well, the gap between the rich and poor, income inequality. Well, guess what? That gap, particularly in 2018, 2019, was the greatest shrinkage in modern economic times. 2018, 2019, the fastest movement of the poor getting less poor, the fastest movement of food insecurity shrinking. Congratulations, Democrats, you have done a great job.

It turns out income inequality really started to expand last year. Inflation crushing people. Except if you own lots of assets. If you are one of the rich people here, and you have multiple houses, you have lots of stocks and bonds, you have other things, you got richer or at least your assets went up in value.

□ 1800

Does anyone else see the cruelty going on here, or does it just not fit because you have a pasty White guy here giving the speech?

But the math is the math. I mean, at some point the math will always win.

And my brothers and sisters in the Phoenix area—now, Phoenix is a big community. Remember, Maricopa County is the fourth most populous—I still think we are catching up with Harris County, but fourth most populous county in the country. It is functionally almost seven congressional districts.

And my brothers and sisters in the Phoenix area had a 10.9 percent inflation year over year. Go talk to those families and explain to them how, hasn't this been a great year for you? Aren't you happy you voted for this?

And then you start to look at some of the other data. And I have got to give the left credit. They have done one thing that I didn't think could happen. I am seeing some polling coming out of my community where, not by a little bit, but by almost double digits, Hispanic voters are now going to vote for Republicans. And then you see this and you start to understand why.

Look what has happened, particularly to the African American and Latino voters—or the population, what has happened to their rents? 28 percent increases. They may have thought Democrats were their protectors, but Democrats have basically been their tormentors because the policies have been so badly designed.

And when they were voting for these, we stood here and explained, do you understand what you are about to set off? And the arrogance—well, in a weird way, thank you. It looks like

now the Hispanic vote may actually be Republican. Is it because we are so wonderful, or their policies have been so brutal to those communities?

So let's have the hits keep going. The United States—you have heard this over and over and lots of other people have come here and talked about this, but it is worth saying again.

What happens when a nation has the ability to be secure in its energy? What happens to a nation when you are Germany; when you are basically beholden to someone else's hydrocarbons?

And there is one here, and I am going to do this a little bit out of order because I find it absolutely fascinating. We should do this one two or three times. Now we understand that a decade, a decade and a half ago, the protests in Germany, and now we find out much of the activism here, the researchers, the reporters, the journalists that actually do investigative, hey, this stuff may have been financed by countries that sell hydrocarbons. I can't imagine who that would be.

But we now know the stories in Germany—you have seen the stories of the suitcases of cash going to their green movement to shut down their base load nuclear, and Germany today is dramatically dirtier in greenhouse gases than they were 10, 15 years ago because they are living on Russian hydrocarbons and coal.

And I think out of the 20-plus nuclear facilities, I think they have one facility and they are scrambling to find out can they put them back into service. It turns out, same concept here.

I would love for our brothers and sisters on the left to help us actually do an investigation of who has been financing these shut down the pipelines, shut down much of the—particularly natural gas, which I have a great fondness for natural gas because of its miracle on reducing greenhouse gases.

But it looks like much of that part of the green movement may have been financed by countries that could care less about the world's global warming. But it was more about market constraints so they could sell more of their product.

And once again, we had become energy independent. We had become an exporter. The Biden administration takes over, and all of a sudden, the extortion games begin. The threat games begin. You start to find out you are going to be invested by the Securities and Exchange Commission because you may not have disclosed your global warming impact on your investments.

And then you wonder why it was actually months ago that natural gas prices went through the ceiling. I was going to say exploded, but that is a really bad pun. It is in the charts. It wasn't an invasion of Ukraine. It was the election of Democrats really, really screwing up policy.

And now, we don't actually have a complete answer on this. I am hoping it is purely for technical reasons because a couple of weeks ago I did a couple of charts here showing how much



base load nuclear is coming offline. And the fact of the matter is when that comes offline, even with adoption of all the clean energy, all the photovoltaic, all the wind, we actually are upside down. We will have to actually use more hydrocarbons.

And then you hear the story this week that the Feds have rescinded license for a Florida facility that is under construction, which I understand there are stunning amounts of capital already sitting there. I hope this is temporary.

But you would think this would be the type of thing we would be struggling, saying we really want non-carbon emitting base load power in this country. Except for the fact of the matter is—and it is reality—photovoltaic, wind, they write a lot of checks to the Democrats.

It is a dark thing I say, but the fact of the matter is, I can walk you through policy after policy after policy here where it seems to be chasing—I mean, look at H.R. 1 and the other things that this place has passed which had ultimately nothing to do with access to voting. It had to do with building a model that elects Democrats.

I mean, financing Democratic campaigns with six to one money; industrializing ballot harvesting because they have the networks to do that? I mean, it is just—

But, once again, we virtue signal. We say pretty words, and then just hope that the public never finds out what is actually underlying in the real piece of legislation.

And back to what I said before, congratulations Democrats. You burned 23 percent more coal last year.

Yes, I am from Arizona. We are one of the photovoltaic—I mean, it is a Holy Grail where we are. Power actually almost goes to zero for two, three, four hours in the afternoon because we produce so much. But let's get the policies right.

We need storage. There are some breakthroughs in storage now. I have a fascination with the rust iron battery. It doesn't work in a car because it is really big, really heavy, but it works in a utility scale.

But will the left take responsibility that they say one thing and the proof, they burnt 23 percent more coal last year. They made greenhouse gases worse. Pretty rhetoric isn't good math.

And the movement of natural gas—so the folks that say we have got to stop pipelines; have you seen what the pipelines actually look like in the United States? They are everywhere.

So the brain trust here raises lots of money; does lots of campaigns. We are going to cancel something like Keystone so they can put the oil on railcars, or maybe shove it out to the West Coast of Canada so it can be shipped to Asia? Because heaven knows, when they crack it, refine it, they do it in a really clean, well-regulated, EPA-controlled facilities, right?

It had nothing to do with what was good for the environment. It had to do with what was good for raising money.

And now the brain trust gets to deal with the mess they have created policywise. So now we get to see great stories that we are out visiting Venezuela. We are out visiting other countries that functionally are either—I accept the humiliation. Let's take the humiliation.

But if my brothers and sisters over here are truly committed to their green agenda, aren't they just horrified that the decision and policies that they have set up have actually made the environment worse, and now we are actually going to go to countries that actually do it in a filthy fashion.

Huge global warming impacts in the way they pull their hydrocarbon, and that is actually who we are reaching out to ask for their help.

Of course, I think the real reality, the reason they do is because they have an idea what is about to hit them this election cycle because they have made working men and women's lives, the hard working men and women's lives in this country more miserable, and they are pedaling as fast as they can to find a way to back off the damage they have done.

So let's also see the efficiencies. Remember, we are going to have an administration with no drama. We are going to bring professionalism back.

Well, great. Passport backlog now at 2 million. VA claim backlog over a quarter million. IRS returns backed up over 24 million. SSA hearings, taking functionally almost a year.

Tell me something—so back to my opening question, give me something, anything, one thing that unified leftist control of this government has done to make people's lives better; to make the future of this country better? It has been like a misery factory.

And then, the next board, I want to point out, and it is just one of dozens of examples, but it is for people out there who may be paying attention to understand what is said over there has nothing to do with what they actually do.

So remember the build back better, you had the Speaker and the President and their spokespeople, well, if we spend all this money, if we engage in this policy, it will be good for inflation.

Mr. Speaker, can you tell me my time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, so, tucked into—now here is the great irony. So we found this, tucked into their thousands and thousands of pages of build back better, because, remember, on one hand, they are telling you, hey, we are going to make things more efficient. We are going to actually help reduce inflation. Oh, except for the way that if you actually find out it is a bunch of pandering to the unions, and they made it so you can't automate ports. Huh?

So you are giving us speeches about how the supply chains are the real responsibility for inflation, and build back better is supposed to help infla-

tion, except for you have done the very things that will make it so just the opposite happens. You have made it so I can't automate ports legally anymore.

So all this money, your largesse, you are going to throw out will go to green stuff at ports, but you can't make it more efficient.

You lied to the American people. And how many of my brothers and sisters on the left even knew these sorts of little land mines were tucked into. I mean, they had the unionization of all the government employees in my State if they want the largesse money for family and medical leave; yet they had to do it through a collective bargaining agreement.

The legislation was pandering to those who financed their campaigns, and it would make people's lives more miserable.

I mean, think of that. Inside their build back better was you can't automate ports. You can't make this stuff up.

And then you start to realize, why do we have so many unfilled jobs? Something went horribly off the rails here.

When we functionally—and I need to update this chart because apparently the number is actually even worse.

But we have—I have a fixation on demographic issues. I have done lots of presentations here on the floor, because demographics are actually the primary driver of our U.S. sovereign debt, and Democrat policies continue to make the policy sets around that worse.

So we have 1.5 million more of other brothers and sisters who have said, I quit, I am out of here, I am taking early retirement, I leave, than we expected. Instead of encouraging our brothers and sisters to stay in the economy because we have got to step up productivity because if we don't step up productivity, we can't start to knock down inflation.

Remember, what is inflation? It is too many dollars chasing too few goods.

There is a couple of ways you attack inflation. You can squeeze down the money supply, and you saw that happen with interest rates starting to go up. Or you could also do what Reagan did in 1981. People forget this. Paul Volcker is jacking up interest rates and jacking up interest rates.

Congress, a Democrat Congress at that time, also did a tax cut, a tax reform to try to make business more productive so they would make more stuff. Remember, too many dollars chasing too few goods and services; make more goods and services.

□ 1815

Then, when you are driving people out of the workforce, how do you make more goods and services? Get the policy sets right.

You say you care about inflation, you care about it crushing working men and women, and then you do the very things that continue to make it worse in a society.

When we get through this period of misery, we still have the thing that wipes us out as a society, leads us to decades of misery. The current calculation basically says, in 29 years, my new math says we get to be about 210 percent of debt-to-GDP. That is publicly held debt.

Remember, last year, we were borrowing functionally \$47,000 a second. I know most of this place just cares about surviving the next election. I mean, look at the legislation that keeps being offered. But is there at all a moral responsibility here to understand this destroys your kids, this destroys your grandkids, this destroys the future generations? We will be handing the next couple of generations a much poorer—they will live poorer—country than we inherited.

This is \$112 trillion of publicly borrowed money adjusted for inflation. This isn't my math; this is CBO's math from a year ago. This is before the crazy spending of last year.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to the mike, I shared with you I was a bit cranky, and I had had a lot of coffee. I don't believe Democrats are evil. Misguided, yes, but I believe many of them are my friends. They have good hearts. But you have to stop the policies that hurt people. You have to stop hurting people, and you have to stop making the Nation poorer.

There are a number of us whose ideas, that aren't even traditionally Republican, we could embrace. I mean, curing diabetes is one of them. Is that Republican or Democrat? It is neither. It is just moral.

Maybe, once in a while, let a Republican have an amendment or an open debate because there is a path. There is a path where we can make our future better, but you have to stop the blood-letting.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to go back and have some decaf.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

#### AMERICA IN CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. GREENE) for 30 minutes.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about America in crisis, and it is crisis after crisis.

The American people can hardly get their feet underneath them. You see, after riots, the next thing that came was COVID, and then elections, and now more COVID mandates, masks, more COVID, and now, potentially, the thoughts of war.

But there is a lot more happening on top of that. We are in a real crisis in America, especially with American energy. You see, right now, the number one call I receive in my office from my

constituents—and it is mainly the only thing they are calling about—is the price of gas.

The price of gas, the average right now, is \$4.32. People calling my office are saying they can hardly afford to fill up their tank. They are not sure if they are going to be able to fill up their tank to take their kids to school, to be able to go to the grocery store and afford the high cost of food now. They are just not sure where this is going.

They also call and say they don't understand why the Biden administration, why Congress, why our Federal Government isn't doing anything to help Americans be able to pay for gas at the pump.

You see, it wasn't too long ago that we were energy independent in America. There was a different mindset in charge. There was a mindset of putting our country first, our tax dollars first, putting Americans first, and considering ramping up energy in America and growing energy in America instead of declining and killing energy in America.

But now, that seems to be the way of our government. It is hurting Americans, and people cannot afford it. This should not be a political issue. This is an issue for every single person that drives a car and truck.

Now, it seems to be the goal is to make every single American drive an electric vehicle. If that is the goal, there is a big problem here. It is not up to the government, the United States Government, to force people to buy an electric vehicle. It should be up to the United States Government to do things like take care of our national security, secure our border, help oil companies produce more oil to increase energy independence, increase natural gas production, continue to build more nuclear, to grow energy in America. But that doesn't seem to be the way.

No, we are looking at the third straight week in a row of over \$100 a barrel of oil. Currently, it is at \$112.12. This is a disaster.

In March 2020, President Trump directed the Department of Energy to purchase 30 million barrels to begin filling our strategic reserves. But President Biden announced in his State of the Union that he would once again tap the strategic reserves and release 30 million barrels of oil in a desperate attempt to reduce gas prices here at home.

Now, Biden is considering releasing even more. This follows an SPR release of 50 million barrels of oil in November 2021, which did nothing to prevent the spike in gas prices. And, no, it is not what is happening in Ukraine. This was happening before Ukraine.

The SPR is supposed to be used for national security emergencies and major weather events. These are our emergency oil supplies. But that doesn't seem to be the case here. It seems to be the continuing plan to reduce America into being dependent on foreign countries.

You see, the biggest problem started on day one when the Keystone XL pipeline was completely stopped. That would have supplied 830,000 barrels of oil from Canada to U.S. refineries. That would have helped Americans once that was finished. But, no, that was an executive order by President Biden to suspend it, to suspend all oil and gas leasing on Federal lands and waters. That was a continued America last energy plan.

While a Federal judge ruled the leasing bans to be illegal, the Biden administration has issued zero new leases on Federal lands. That is not helping Americans.

Another issue that happened in May 2021, President Biden removed sanctions against Nord Stream 2, which were previously put in place by former President Trump. In February 2022, President Biden reversed course and reimposed the Trump sanctions, noting the overwhelming incentive to move away from Russian gas.

President Biden's far-left socialist agenda, Build Back Better, was an effort to cripple domestic energy by increasing oil and gas production payments to 20 percent, increasing bonding and surety requirements to more than 15 times their current levels, imposing a new severance tax, and establishing new annual fees of \$10,000 per mile for offshore pipelines.

President Biden's fiscal year 2022 budget request explicitly opposed funding the construction or maintenance of projects that would lower the cost of gas, diesel, or energy derived from fossil fuels.

Biden's Department of Energy has slow-walked liquefied natural gas exports that could reduce Europe's dependence on Russia.

These are all the things that have led to the increase of the price of gas at the pump that is hurting my constituents in my district in northwest Georgia. This is hurting Americans. None of these things have helped us.

Now, here is what we have to consider. We also have bigger problems. The Consumer Price Index, which is a key inflation index, hit a 40-year high in February. The CPI increased to 7.9 percent over the past 12 months, and this is inflation that happened before Russia invaded Ukraine. You can't blame Putin for that one. This is all happening right here at home.

Let's talk about inflation and how it is hurting Americans. Here is one thing that everyone can understand. Used cars and trucks are up 41.2 percent; 41.2 percent is unbelievable.

If you have been on vacation lately, you know that if you try to rent a car or truck, they are very hard to find.

Gasoline is up 38 percent.

Lodging away from home, going to a hotel while you are trying to go on vacation, or, say, people that are traveling for business, that is up 25.1 percent.

Now, if you are cooking at home and trying to save money making a meal

for your family, bacon is up 18.8 percent. Peanut butter, for those great peanut butter and jelly sandwiches that moms and dads make for kids' lunches, is up 15.6 percent. Pork is up 14 percent.

Clothing is up. Dresses are up 13.5 percent.

Airline fees are up 12.7 percent.

The cost of a new vehicle is up 12.4 percent. If you are in the market for a truck, well, guess what? You will have a hard time getting one, or an SUV, because many of them are sitting on the lots, still waiting for microchips.

Eggs are up 11.4 percent. Coffee is up 10.5 percent. Baby food is up 8.4 percent.

Transportation services are up 6.6 percent.

Beer is up. You know there is a problem when the cost of beer is up 5.3 percent.

Now, 2021 went down as the worst year for inflation since 1981, but it looks to be 2022 is going to be worse. The problem for Americans is, it is not that anyone is increasing their wages. They are actually being hurt by all of these economic forces that are hitting American families hard.

Don't forget, the same people that were big Democrat voters, which are those people suffering with big student loans, these are people that are working their jobs, trying to pay their student loans, trying to afford their car payments. They can't afford gas at the pump, and no one seems to be helping them.

Inflation is a tax on everyone, and no one is exempt. That is what people are complaining about here in America, not what the people that run around Washington think. It is a lot different when you talk to people on the ground.

Now, another thing people are very upset about is what is happening at our border. We have a true border crisis, and it is time to start caring about it.

Listen, it is an insult to all border communities because President Biden visited Texas but continued to refuse to visit the southern border or other surrounding communities that his failed open border policies have endangered.

The real issue is, while President Biden is more interested in working with Iran, Russia, and China to go re-enter an Iran nuclear deal, he doesn't seem to care about what is happening at the border.

According to Customs and Border Patrol data, there were 153,941 migrant encounters at our southern border in January. That is a 96 percent increase from the previous year. This was the second-worst January on record. Of the 153,941 illegal immigrants encountered at the border, the Biden administration released 62,573 of them into the United States.

This new data comes at a time when ICE deportations are down 70 percent from 2020, the fewest number of deportations in 5 years. This equates to an average of just 100 deportations a day,

even as Border Patrol agents encountered up to 7,000 illegal immigrants daily.

But only 100 get deported? Why? You have to ask why.

Since Biden took office, over 2 million illegal immigrants have been apprehended at our southern border. Biden has still not visited the border even during this historic crisis. It doesn't seem that President Biden even cares.

Border officials have estimated that nearly 400,000 illegal immigrants have escaped into the United States without being caught under President Biden. But we don't even know if that is the right number. That is just an estimate.

Out of 104,171 migrants issued notices to report by ICE between the end of March and the end of August 2021, 47,705 failed to report. They just don't bother showing up.

□ 1830

There were 10,763 arrests of migrants with criminal convictions in fiscal year 2021; that is up 2,438 from fiscal year 2020, and that is up 4,269 in fiscal year 2019.

But here is the real issue. Fentanyl is flowing across our borders. Seizures of fentanyl increased by 134 percent in fiscal year 2021 under President Biden's watch.

Now, fentanyl is the number one reported reason of cause of death for young people ages 18 to 45. What are we doing in our country when this deadly drug is flowing across our wide-open border that our President doesn't even seem to care about, that no one is interested in closing the border or securing the border?

How are we failing Americans and failing young people, where fentanyl that comes over from China is so easily flowing across the border? This is a disaster. It is a complete disaster.

Now, what I find absolutely mind-boggling is how here in Congress we passed a \$1.5 trillion omnibus bill last week that was 2,741 pages, and we didn't even have 24 hours to read it. That is a complete failure to the American people and the American tax dollars who are the ones paying the \$1.5 trillion for the omnibus bill.

There is not a company or a small business in the private sector that operates this way. But our Federal Government is reckless and out of control, and the American people are feeling the consequences. You just have to ask the question: Why? Why does Congress work this way? It is just not working. It is not working for the American people.

Now, this week we were addressed by President Zelenskyy and the crisis that the Ukrainian people are going through. It was heart-breaking to hear the stories he told, the video that he showed, the tragedies that we are hearing about over and over, but we also aren't given enough information.

Last week, Congress approved \$13.6 billion to go to Ukraine. Now, this is

after years and years of sending billions of dollars in aid to Ukraine and funding all kinds of things in Ukraine. Who does Congress work for? I think that is the greatest question. What is the purpose of this institution where we take American taxpayers' dollars and send it to countries all over the world? We send money to all kinds of foreign countries and fund all kinds of things.

Now, one of the most fascinating stories that went on and on across the internet and news companies—you heard it on TV and saw it on social media everywhere—was this big discussion about biolabs. Now, I thought it was pretty fascinating, a lot of people were interested in it, but we were all told no, no, no, you can't talk about biolabs because that is fake news, that the United States doesn't fund biolabs in Ukraine—the United States wouldn't do that.

Well, come to find out, in fact, it is true. The same news companies and the same sources are telling us that it is not true that the United States funds biolabs—you could also look up their older news stories from years ago where, in fact, they were talking about the United States funding biolabs. So the misinformation going on is real and the American people deserve to know what they are paying for.

This comes on the heels of after 2 years—and this is just so tragic—that not only the United States but the entire world has been dealing with COVID-19. Now, it has been a true tragedy what has happened with COVID. Over 968,000 Americans have died—that is according to The New York Times today—over 6 million people have died worldwide. That is according to The New York Times today.

For the last 2 years, Americans have dealt with the consequences of U.S. funding these labs and funding the gain of function research. Now, it is something that we really have to recognize and we have to talk about, but our government did fund the gain of function research. We know that to be true through EcoHealth Alliance.

The gain of function research is what allowed the virus that is transmitted between bats to be turned into a virus—like a Dr. Frankenstein virus—that can be transmitted between humans. We have to ask the question: Why would the United States Government engage in funding something as horrific as that? How is that science? It is a good thing to ask these questions.

Now, here is what else is interesting. Just today Dr. Fauci, who happened to be the one to help fund the gain of function research, decided to come out and say that mask mandates should be brought back. This is at a time where we are finally getting rid of mask mandates. He is also recommending a fourth COVID vaccine shot.

Now, I don't know about you guys but many of us were vaccinated as kids against polio, we had our MMR, and I have never seen the CDC coming out,

saying, oh, you got to get your second polio shot, you got to get your third, you got to get your fourth, and this may continue to keep going.

I think the question we all should ask is: When does it stop and when are enough vaccines enough? We don't have that question because now Congress is discussing and debating a future COVID bill, an emergency bill. This is a future COVID bill to fund future variants and future vaccines. And not only future vaccines for the United States, but future vaccines for the entire world because somehow the United States is responsible for vaccinating the world against future COVID variants that we haven't even seen yet.

And somehow Congress thinks that we should do emergency funding, possibly up to \$22 billion to study and prepare for future COVID variants and future COVID vaccines, and as many things as we need to do, but yet we aren't seeing them. How is that necessary to have emergency funding at \$22 billion to fund something that we don't know is going to happen and shouldn't happen and would never have happened without the U.S.-funded gain of function research to the Wuhan lab? I think these are questions worth asking.

Now, another thing I would like to point out is President Trump had asked Congress for \$22 billion to build a wall down at the southern border. Imagine if Congress had found it important or recognized the important need to go ahead and fund \$22 billion back in 2017 or 2018, that wall would have been built.

I can tell you right now, I don't think we would be seeing and hearing about the numbers of illegal immigrants coming across our border and deadly fentanyl coming across like this. Imagine if Congress had taken seriously border security under President Trump and funded that \$22 billion then that now Congress is considering funding for future COVID that we don't even have yet. These are good questions to ask.

These are the kind of questions that the regular American people ask, not the ones that live here in the Washington D.C. bubble; they are very disconnected here with real America.

Now, this is the thing that I just find so amazing. As we consider funding future COVID and future COVID vaccines, we have people at home that are sick and tired of their children being masked in school. They do not want to be forced to take a vaccine that they feel they should have the ability to decide about their own health, if they want to take it or not.

We are still trying to get back on track with not having to wear masks on airplanes, not having to send our kids to school to be masked, and not have to be shut down anymore. We have not recovered yet from the COVID crisis of the past 2 years. But, no, we have to consider more future COVID variants and future vaccines, and vaccinating the world against future COVID everything.

It never seems to stop, it is crisis after crisis. Unfortunately, a U.S.-funded gain of function research in a U.S.-funded lab in China gave birth to COVID-19 that has hurt the entire world.

Here is what we need to discuss. We need to ask the question: What is happening in these U.S.-funded labs? And we need to be willing to talk about it. We also need to ask the questions about the VAERS statistics. What if there are vaccine injuries? What if there are vaccine deaths?

It is okay to ask these questions because these may have affected people's lives, and that is important to do, right? But when we are talking about biolabs, we do know for a fact that the U.S. has funded the contracts not only to take over the labs, reconstruct them, but also build them. This goes through grants through private companies at millions and millions of dollars.

Now, what if these biolabs are handling very dangerous pathogens that may lead to the deaths in people in the areas. There are reports of possibly deadly pathogens escaping these biolabs in places like Ukraine, Georgia, Kazakhstan, that is responsible for killing people. What if that is true? I think these are questions that we should ask because no American citizen wants to be held morally and ethically responsible, and the U.S. Government should not be funding something that is killing people in a country that is not even our own, let alone here at home.

These are worthy questions. For that reason, because it has become such an issue and because it upsets so many people that I talk to constantly, I have introduced a bill to stop taxpayer funding for bioweapons and eliminate these programs from the Federal Government because no government should be creating bioweapons. That is evil and wrong.

Now, the name of this bill is the Stopping the Spread of Taxpayer-Funded Bioweapons Act. What if strange outbreaks surrounding U.S.-funded biolabs are the result of these labs and the work that is taking place in them? What if these labs are creating viruses just like COVID-19?

This is something that all of us should be against. That is why it would be so important to pass this bill and make sure that our United States Government is never funding anything deadly and never funding something like COVID-19. These are consequences that we cannot take and we should not handle and we should not ever consider.

Now, as we go further, we have a lot of issues to consider. We have an economy that is definitely in trouble. We have hyperinflation and gas prices out of control. We are looking at what is going to happen in Ukraine with Russia and what is going to happen in the world with all these sanctions. There are some issues to consider.

Now, the value of our dollar is extremely important. The value of our

dollar affects our entire economy. If the value of our dollar were to go down suddenly, that would affect all Americans. Right now we are in a critical time where Saudi Arabia is discussing with China—talking to them about possibly switching from the petrodollar to trading with China's currency.

We have sanctioned Russia. And as Russia is looking at taking Ukraine and they are invading Ukraine and killing people in Ukraine, Russia has turned to China. Just recently Russia made a \$117.5 billion deal with President Xi of China. That deal is to sell oil and gas to China.

Now with sanctions tightening on Putin and Russia, will we see Russia turn to China and switch to China's currency? What if Russia and Saudi Arabia switch from the dollar to China's currency? Then think further, what happens if countries like Venezuela or Cuba or any other country turns to China's currency?

If we go into a situation where we have two world competing currencies, the dollar is going to be hit very hard, and that is going to hurt America's economy, that is going to hurt every single one of us. If we think we are suffering under high inflation right now and high gas prices, well, we haven't seen anything yet. This is a dangerous situation and these are the things that I don't hear being talked about here in Congress very much.

These are not the things that our leaders are considering when they are beating the drums of war—wanting to go in and go to war with nuclear Russia. These are not the things that are being considered for our children and for our country's future, but these are the most important things they should be considering. Unfortunately, they are not.

□ 1845

Now, what we all should be doing is encouraging President Zelenskyy and President Putin to get to the negotiating table and stop people from being killed. That should be the most important thing we care about.

Sanctions are being put in place, and we should be considering what are going to be the real human costs when we are stopping countries from trading very important products like grain, fertilizer, and energy because it may be a punishment to those governments, but the real punishment is to the people in other countries and our own.

So my questions for our Congress—our United States Congress—are: Which country do we honestly serve? Which country do we honestly care about? And which people do we care about?

Because this body right here is funded by the American people and their hard-earned tax dollars, and the American people and their hard-earned tax dollars are the people we should consider first.

It is the United States of America we should consider first. It is the United

States currency, the dollar, we should consider first, and it is the United States economy we should consider first, our small businesses, our big businesses, and our border that should matter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, tonight, I will finish with this: I think it is important for the United States Congress to talk more, to slow down in our decisions, to read our bills—every single one of us has the time to read them—and for every single one of us to vote in person—not by proxy—and not simply by saying “yea” or “nay”.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2022

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA) and the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2022 (S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress)), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2022 as published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021.

In accordance with the CBA and S. Con. Res. 14, this revision makes an adjustment to previous amounts for program integrity for the Internal Revenue Service. Those amounts are contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (Public Law 117-103). These adjustments are allowable under section 4005(b) and section 4007 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th).

Accordingly, I am revising the aggregate spending level for fiscal year 2022 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2022. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on October 27, 2021.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Kellie Larkin of the Budget Committee staff.

Sincerely,

JOHN YARMUTH,  
Chairman.

TABLE 1.—BUDGET AGGREGATE TOTALS  
(On-budget amounts in millions of dollars)

	2022	2022–2031
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority .....	4,168,314	n.a.
Outlays Total .....	4,505,637	n.a.
Revenues .....	3,401,380	38,957,374
Revision for the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 (P.L. 117–103):		
Budget Authority .....	–417	n.a.
Outlays Total .....	–366	n.a.
Revenues .....	n.a.	n.a.
Revised Aggregates:		
BA .....	4,167,897	n.a.
OT .....	4,505,271	n.a.
Revenues .....	3,401,380	38,957,374

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2023 through 2031 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS  
(Unified amounts in millions of dollars)

	2022
Current Discretionary Allocation:	
BA .....	1,530,018
OT .....	1,685,953
Revision for Program Integrity (P.L. 117–103):	
BA .....	–417
OT .....	–366
Revised Discretionary Allocation:	
BA .....	1,529,601
OT .....	1,685,587
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA .....	1,356,059
OT .....	1,355,730

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H.R. 3076. An act to provide stability to and enhance the services of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 9 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 18, 2022, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3654. A letter from the Senior Bureau Official, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the emergency third party transfer authorization from the Netherlands to Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EC-3655. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's 2021 21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act Report; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-3656. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of a final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2022-05; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2022-0051, Sequence No.: 2] received March 9, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-3657. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Management Division, Office of Policy and Strategy, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Immigrant Juvenile Petitions [CIS No.: 2474-09; DHS Docket No.: USCIS-2009-0004] (RIN: 1615-AB81) received March 11, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3658. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health

and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Child Welfare Outcomes 2019: Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 679b(a)(5); Public Law 105-89, Sec. 203(a); (111 Stat. 2127); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-3659. A letter from the Chair, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting the Commission's March 2022 Report to Congress: Medicare Payment Policy, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 280g-15; Public Law 111-148, Sec. 399V-4(h)(3); (124 Stat. 1013); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. NEAL (for himself, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. KIND, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. REED, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. MEIJER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KEATING, and Mrs. SPARTZ):

H.R. 7108. A bill to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Ways and Means, Rules, Foreign Affairs, and the Judiciary; considered and passed.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 7109. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to require public lodging establishments to waive minimum age requirements for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7110. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify and expand authorization of support for chaplain-led programs for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 7111. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. KUSTOFF):

H.R. 7112. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to make grants for the establishment or expansion of internet exchange facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7113. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to prohibit sums in the Thrift Savings Fund from being invested in any security of an entity based in the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7114. A bill to impose retaliatory tariffs on Chinese goods for financially supporting Russia through the increased purchases of Russian agricultural products during Russia's ongoing invasion of Ukraine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAMMACK (for herself, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. PALAZZO, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. RESCIENTHALER, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. DUNN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CAWTHORN, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 7115. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 7116. A bill to provide for improvements in the implementation of the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Armed Services, Veterans' Affairs, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. LATURNER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MANN, Ms. MACE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ELLZEY, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 7117. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to prohibit a State from receiving or using funds or certain donations from private entities for the administration of an election for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act relating to the sharing of death information with the Do Not Pay working system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas (for herself and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 7119. A bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 to authorize the selection of eligible projects to be carried out using collaborative project delivery methods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7120. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to promulgate regulations relating to the disclosure of certain commercial data, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. BUDD, Mr. VAN DREW, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 7121. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to maintain a list of the country of origin of all drugs marketed in the United States, to ban the use of Federal funds for the purchase of drugs manufactured in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Veterans' Affairs, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 7122. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out teacher leadership programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas (for herself, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 7123. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study to identify barriers to reducing homelessness by providing housing assistance under the Public Housing and Housing Choice Voucher programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas:

H.R. 7124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the public reporting of certain contributions received by charitable organizations from foreign governments and foreign political parties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 7125. A bill to amend the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Act to prevent the proliferation of biological weapons under the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Appropriations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 7126. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require Members of Congress to file the reports on transactions in stocks, bonds, commodities futures, and other forms of securities which are required under such Act not later than 7 days after the transactions are completed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Mr. CAREY, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BENTZ, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. MAST, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 7127. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act to prohibit the Secretary from enforcing any drug or vaccine mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 7128. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize of the Secretary of the Treasury to place prohibitions or conditions on certain transmittals of funds in connection with jurisdictions, financial institu-

tions, international transactions, or types of accounts of primary money laundering concern; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 7129. A bill to prohibit the importation of crude oil from Iran; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHELE:

H.R. 7130. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to convey the Makua Military Reservation to the State of Hawaii and establish a trust fund for such conveyance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. MORELLE, and Ms. STEVENS):

H.R. 7131. A bill to promote economic growth and recovery throughout the Great Lakes region, to restore and to protect America's principal source of fresh water, which holds twenty percent of the world's freshwater, making it the largest system in the world, to foster innovation and to advance world-class workforce, education, training, and adjustment institutions for better jobs in the Great Lakes region, to strengthen and to expand the core U.S. manufacturing and industrial base, and the required energy systems to sustain and to power production, and to work with the federal Government and provinces of Canada on our mutual Great Lakes challenges including the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 7132. A bill to preserve safe access to communications services for survivors of domestic violence and other crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7133. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require certain lobbyists to report certain contacts with agencies within 48 hours, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7134. A bill to limit the use of Federal funds for the use of the travel expenses of senior Federal officials in contravention of certain regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7135. A bill to provide that the salaries of Members of a House of Congress will be held in escrow if that House has not agreed to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022 by April 15, 2021, to eliminate automatic pay adjustments for Members of Congress, to prohibit the use of funds provided for the official travel expenses of Members of Congress and other officers and employees of the legislative branch for first-class airline accommodations, and to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish a uniform 5-year post-employment ban on lobbying by former Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Oversight and



Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7136. A bill to require the Speaker of the House of Representatives to convene a session of the House on each day in which a Government shutdown is in effect, to prohibit the use of funds for the official travel of Members of the House of Representatives during any period in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7137. A bill to enact House Resolution 895, One Hundred Tenth Congress, (establishing the Office of Congressional Ethics) into permanent law; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OBERNOLTE (for himself and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H.R. 7138. A bill to establish procedures to include certain foreign persons that pose a threat to the security of supply chains of Internet of Things devices on the Department of Commerce's Entity List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 7139. A bill to codify Executive Order 13949; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 7140. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the ability of Medicare and Medicaid providers to access the National Practitioner Data Bank for the purpose of conducting employee background checks; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. STANSBURY (for herself, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. CARSON):

H.R. 7141. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to States to empower public institutions of higher education in the States to provide student support services to students from low-income backgrounds, historically underrepresented students, first-generation college enrollees, parenting students, students with disabilities, and student veterans; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Ms. TLAIB):

H.R. 7142. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue a final rule adding as a class all perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances with at least one fully fluorinated carbon atom to the list of hazardous air pollutants under section 112(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(b)), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 7143. A bill to provide for energy rebates to individual taxpayers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 7144. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a feedback tool for use by members of the Armed Forces and their spouses to identify, rate, and compare housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. MORELLE, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 7145. A bill to encourage employer participation in apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 7146. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for penalty-free withdrawals from retirement accounts for certain emergency expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia (for herself, Mr. MELJER, and Ms. JACOBS of California):

H.R. 7147. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to make publicly available on a website of the Department of Defense the cost to each United States taxpayer of certain contingency operations conducted by the United States Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. ELLZEY):

H.J. Res. 77. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H. Res. 989. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that United States policy should encourage Russian Government officials, including diplomats, to abandon Putin's war with Ukraine, and that Russian officials who defect should be granted expedited admission to the United States as refugees if they clear all applicable vetting and security procedures; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BANKS (for himself, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. CARL, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. GARCIA of California, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. DUNN, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. FALLON, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. HILL, Mr. STEIL, Mr. BACON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. ROSE, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. BARR, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BOST, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. ARRINGTON):

H. Res. 990. A resolution opposing engaging Russia for reviving any form of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) with Iran, opposing removing terrorism sanctions

on Iran while Iran's support of terrorist activities remains unchanged, opposing restoring any form of the JCPOA while the issue of Iran's undeclared nuclear activities remains unresolved; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE (for himself, Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MAST, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. BALDERSON):

H. Res. 991. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the President of the United States should take immediate steps to support the transfer of requested fighter aircraft to the Government of Ukraine for self-defense against invasion of their sovereign state; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statement is submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. NEAL:

H.R. 7108.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7109.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7110.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 7111.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. LONG:

H.R. 7112.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or office thereof.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7113.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 7114.  
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 grants that Congress shall "have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises;" Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 grants that Congress shall "regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among theseveral States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 grants that "The Congress shall have Power to . . . Make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by [the] Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mrs. CAMMACK:

H.R. 7115.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 7116.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. COLE:

H.R. 7117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1

By Ms. CRAIG:

H.R. 7118.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 5, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas:

H.R. 7119.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1—All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 7120.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7121.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Interstate Commerce Clause: Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I.

By Mr. GALLEGUO:

H.R. 7122.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: "[The Congress shall have the power . . .] To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Ms. GARCIA of Texas:

H.R. 7123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. GOODEN of Texas:

H.R. 7124.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common Defense and general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. Thus, Congress has the authority not only to increase taxes, but also, to reduce taxes to promote the general welfare of the United States of America and her citizens. Additionally, Congress has the Constitutional authority to regulate com-

merce among the States and with Indian Tribes, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. GREENE of Georgia:

H.R. 7125.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, United States Constitution

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 7126.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 7127.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. HIMES:

H.R. 7128.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. ISSA:

H.R. 7129.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Authority granted to Congress under Section 8, Article I of the Constitution, the power to regulate commerce.

By Mr. KAHELE:

H.R. 7130.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 7131.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1 (Taxing and Spending Clause)

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 (Commerce Clause)

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 7132.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, the Taxing and Spending Clause: "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7133.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7134.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7135.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7136.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 7137.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18, section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. OBERNOLTE:

H.R. 7138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PFLUGER:

H.R. 7139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 7140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. STANSBURY:

H.R. 7141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 7142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 7143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Sections 7 & 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative powers granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or any Department or Office thereof."

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 7145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 7146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia:

H.R. 7147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. ARRINGTON:

H.J. Res. 77.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 214: Mr. CORREA.  
H.R. 515: Mr. BANKS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. CLYDE.  
H.R. 558: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.  
H.R. 621: Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
H.R. 783: Mr. GOLDEN.  
H.R. 882: Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 1179: Mr. AMODEL.  
H.R. 1297: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 1361: Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 1481: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 1540: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 1568: Mr. TIMMONS.  
H.R. 1644: Mr. YARMUTH.  
H.R. 1665: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 1842: Mr. GUEST, Mr. MRVAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. WELCH, Ms. STANSBURY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. CURTIS, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H.R. 1861: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
H.R. 1933: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MALINOWSKI.  
H.R. 1946: Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK.  
H.R. 1972: Ms. TLAIB.  
H.R. 2038: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H.R. 2174: Mr. GOLDEN.  
H.R. 2192: Mr. CRAWFORD and Mr. GUEST.  
H.R. 2280: Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 2294: Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 2313: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 2351: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. MULLIN.  
H.R. 2489: Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 2525: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MALINOWSKI.  
H.R. 2549: Mr. COURTNEY.  
H.R. 2559: Mr. RYAN.  
H.R. 2565: Mr. SIRES and Mr. CROW.  
H.R. 2718: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
H.R. 2724: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.  
H.R. 2974: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mrs. LESKO.  
H.R. 3072: Ms. SALAZAR.  
H.R. 3095: Mr. ELLZEY.  
H.R. 3115: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 3173: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
H.R. 3203: Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
H.R. 3258: Ms. WILD.  
H.R. 3259: Mr. KUSTOFF.  
H.R. 3281: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 3304: Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 3342: Mr. GOLDEN and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
H.R. 3372: Mr. KAHELE.  
H.R. 3446: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 3483: Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. HAYES.  
H.R. 3488: Ms. ROSS and Mr. HOYER.  
H.R. 3506: Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, and Mr. TIMMONS.  
H.R. 3512: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 3522: Mr. NEGUSE.  
H.R. 3621: Mr. RASKIN, Ms. ROSS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 3770: Ms. KUSTER.  
H.R. 3940: Mr. TORRES of New York.  
H.R. 3946: Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H.R. 4003: Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 4043: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
H.R. 4319: Mr. O'HALLERAN.  
H.R. 4472: Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 4558: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 4634: Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 4672: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 4758: Mr. RYAN.  
H.R. 4794: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Ms. STANSBURY.  
H.R. 4826: Ms. STEVENS.  
H.R. 4834: Mr. DONALDS.  
H.R. 4951: Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CARSON, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.  
H.R. 5016: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 5056: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
H.R. 5232: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. McCLAIN, Mr. McCAUL, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COOPER, and Mrs. LURIA.  
H.R. 5245: Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 5338: Ms. MATSUI and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.  
H.R. 5421: Ms. SALAZAR.  
H.R. 5441: Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 5528: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 5585: Mr. SOTO.  
H.R. 5607: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 5632: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. COMER.  
H.R. 5759: Mr. LAMBORN.  
H.R. 5769: Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 5828: Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 5874: Mr. LAMALFA.  
H.R. 5883: Mr. DELGADO and Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 6006: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio.  
H.R. 6101: Mr. MEUSER.  
H.R. 6127: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina and Mr. STAUBER.  
H.R. 6145: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CLINE, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. BACON, and Mr. PALAZZO.  
H.R. 6181: Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 6184: Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. GALLAGHER.  
H.R. 6201: Ms. ROSS.  
H.R. 6207: Ms. DEGETTE.  
H.R. 6212: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mrs. LESKO.  
H.R. 6219: Mr. NEAL.  
H.R. 6225: Mr. SUOZZI.  
H.R. 6254: Mrs. WALORSKI.  
H.R. 6272: Ms. ADAMS.  
H.R. 6276: Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. BERA.  
H.R. 6308: Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 6337: Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 6482: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. GUEST, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
H.R. 6494: Mr. GOLDEN.  
H.R. 6519: Ms. PINGREE.  
H.R. 6571: Mr. GALLAGHER.  
H.R. 6584: Ms. WILD.  
H.R. 6592: Ms. MACE.  
H.R. 6613: Mr. MRVAN and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 6625: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
H.R. 6629: Ms. VAN DUYN.  
H.R. 6630: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PORTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 6631: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. PORTER, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 6647: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.  
H.R. 6667: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. SWALWELL.  
H.R. 6682: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 6730: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.  
H.R. 6732: Mrs. HINSON and Mr. GOHMERT.  
H.R. 6777: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 6787: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 6823: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 6858: Ms. LETLOW, Mr. STEIL, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Ms. GRANGER.  
H.R. 6865: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 6866: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 6872: Mrs. DEMINGS.  
H.R. 6873: Mrs. DEMINGS.  
H.R. 6891: Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 6911: Mr. ROUZER.  
H.R. 6919: Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 6928: Ms. BUSH.  
H.R. 6934: Mr. ALLRED and Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 6943: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 6970: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. BANKS, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri.  
H.R. 6989: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.R. 6990: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 7014: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BOST, Mr. HUDSON, and Mrs. WAGNER.  
H.R. 7057: Mr. CLYDE.  
H.R. 7058: Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
H.R. 7062: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mrs. MCBATH.  
H.R. 7066: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.  
H.R. 7074: Mr. BROOKS.  
H.R. 7075: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. BENTZ.  
H.R. 7077: Ms. NEWMAN.  
H.R. 7082: Mr. McEACHIN.  
H.R. 7099: Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MRVAN, Ms. NEWMAN, and Mr. LIEU.  
H.R. 7100: Mr. GOHMERT.  
H.J. Res. 3: Mr. GROTHMAN.  
H.J. Res. 46: Mr. DUNCAN.  
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. PALMER, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. HUDSON, Ms. MACE, and Mr. MCKINLEY.  
H.J. Res. 76: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. GROTHMAN.  
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. STAUBER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. CARL, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATURNER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ESTES, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. BALDERSON.  
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. ESPAILLAT.  
H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. MANN.  
H. Con. Res. 78: Mr. POCAN.  
H. Res. 148: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H. Res. 237: Ms. ROSS.  
H. Res. 290: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H. Res. 582: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. GOODEN of Texas.  
H. Res. 888: Mr. MEUSER.  
H. Res. 891: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.  
H. Res. 896: Mr. SCHNEIDER.  
H. Res. 987: Ms. SCANLON, Ms. ROSS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. WILD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BOWMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. WESTERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. PORTER, Mr. TRONE, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. CASTEN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. MACE, Mr. WOMACK, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. LIEU, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. BACON, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. MEIJER.  
H. Res. 988: Mr. GROTHMAN.